



CITY OF AUBURN

Planning Commission – Staff Report

Meeting Date: February 1, 2011

Prepared by: Adrienne Graham, Consulting Planner
Reg Murray, Senior Planner

**ITEM NO.
VI-A**

ATTACHMENT 1

ITEM VI-A: SITE ACCESS DISCUSSION FOR THE BALTIMORE RAVINE SPECIFIC PLAN (BRSP) AND STUDY AREA PROJECT

INTRODUCTION

The Auburn City Council considered the Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan (BRSP) and Study Area Project (Project) at its meeting on January 13, 2011. The City Council passed a motion directing the Planning Commission to review two access alternatives for the BRSP project and to recommend one of the two alternatives for Council consideration. The first alternative is the Pacific Street Extension located on the west side of Auburn Folsom Road, opposite Pacific Street. The second alternative is also located on the west side of Auburn Folsom Road approximately 750' south of the Auburn Folsom Road/Pacific Street intersection.

PURPOSE OF ITEM

The purpose of this item is for the Planning Commission to provide direction to staff regarding the information needed by the Commission to compare the two access alternatives. Staff will then provide the requested information to the Commission at its February 15, 2011, meeting.

BACKGROUND

The issue of access for the BRSP Project has been addressed by the Auburn Planning Commission on several occasions as noted below:

- **December 15, 2009** – The Commission held a public hearing to overview the contents of the draft BRSP and to accept public comments on the proposed plan (see Tab G of the September 21, 2010 staff report binder). During the hearing, questions were raised by Commissioners and the public regarding the access routes proposed for the plan.
- **March 26, 2010** - The Planning Commission conducted a site tour of the BRSP project and surrounding areas, which included several access locations considered for the BRSP project. In response to the access issues and questions raised at the December 15, 2009 hearing, staff prepared a Memorandum to the Commission regarding Access Considerations for the BRSP dated March 26, 2010 (see Tab R of the September 21, 2010 staff report binder). The Commission also received a memo from the applicant engineer dated January 18, 2010 which provided a discussion on site access alternatives (see Tab I of the September 21, 2010 binder).
- **July 13, 2010** – The Planning Commission held a public hearing to take public comment on the Draft EIR prepared for the BRSP.

- **September 21, 2010** - The Planning Commission held a public hearing to review and take public comment on the BRSP Project and associated approvals. The Planning Commission staff report for the September 21st hearing (see binder) included additional information regarding site access issues. Included with the staff report was a memo from the applicant dated September 1, 2010 that provided supplemental information regarding site access issues (Tab S of the September 21, 2010 binder). During the public hearing, the Commission received comment on a number of different issues, including project access. Based on public comment, the Commission directed staff to provide additional information regarding access options to the project. The hearing was continued to November 16, 2010.
- **November 16, 2010** – The Planning Commission renewed their review of the BRSP project. The staff report included additional information regarding site access in response to the Planning Commission's request at the September 21, 2010 hearing. The Planning Commission voted 4-0 to approve the BRSP EIR as well as the Large Lot Tentative Map for Plan Area 1, and recommended approval of the BRSP and other associated approvals to the City Council.
- **November 24, 2010** – The City received an appeal from Mark Smith of the BRSP EIR and the Large Lot Tentative Map for Plan Area 1.
- **January 13, 2010** – The Auburn City Council held a public hearing to consider the appeal submitted by Mark Smith, as well as to review and consider the BRSP project and associated project approvals. The Council staff report is provided as Attachment 1.

As noted above, the City Council denied the appeal and tasked the Planning Commission with reviewing two alternative points of access into the BRSP Project from Auburn Folsom Road, and to recommend one of the two alternatives. The first alternative is the Pacific Street Extension located on the west side of Auburn Folsom Road, opposite Pacific Street. The second alternative is also located on the west side of Auburn Folsom Road approximately 750' south of the Auburn Folsom Road/Pacific Street intersection.

The Planning Commission hearings on February 1, 2011 and February 15, 2011 will only consider access alternatives for the BRSP. The City Council tabled discussion on the BRSP Project at their January 13, 2011 hearing until such time as the Planning Commission rendered its recommendation on the two access options identified above. The City Council will take up discussion on the access issues, and the project, at a later date following receipt of the Commission's recommendation. Public Notice of the Council hearing will be provided once the Council hearing date has been determined.

DESCRIPTION OF ACCESS ALTERNATIVES UNDER REVIEW

The two access alternatives that the City Council remanded back to the Planning Commission for review and recommendation were Alternatives #4 and #5 on the Site Access Alternatives map (see Attachment 2) presented with the March 26, 2010 access memorandum (Tab R of the September 21, 2010 staff report). Alternative #4 is located opposite Pacific Street, west of Auburn Folsom Road. Alternative #5 is also located on the west side of Auburn Folsom Road,

roughly 750' south of the Pacific Street intersection. Subsequent to Council's direction on January 13th, the applicant has provided a more detailed site access plan illustrating the two options (see Exhibit A). This plan has been refined to provide additional detail regarding topography, the road alignments, and grading. The two options are described briefly below, and the applicant's engineer has provided a memo (Attachment 6) further summarizing each option.

Pacific Street Extension (Alternative #4): With Alternative #4, Pacific Street would be extended from Auburn-Folsom Road west over the UP rail line with the construction of a new bridge. The alignment will continue southwest over property currently owned by the Auburn Recreation District, and then further to the southwest across property owned by the Sipe family to the northeast corner of the BRSP area. The overall length of this option from Auburn Folsom Road into the BRSP would be 4,900 feet long. In order to bridge the UPRR tracks immediately west of Auburn Folsom Road, a 22-foot high roadway embankment would be required. The bridge spanning the rails line would be approximately 250 feet long.

Rail line crossing south of Pacific Street: This option would provide a connection to Auburn-Folsom Road approximately 750-feet south of Pacific Street, near the existing Boardman canal. The total roadway length for this option would also be approximately 4,900 feet. Significant fill will be required to provide adequate clearance, resulting in roughly 12-foot tall embankments and a bridge span of approximately 100 feet. A 90-degree elbow would be required on the west side of the rail line to travel around the hill on ARD and Sipe property. The alignment would then move through the ravines and the eastern portion of the BRSP on the same alignment as the Pacific Street option above.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

The purpose of this item is to identify the information that Staff is currently developing for the Commission's review of the two options, and to receive feedback regarding any additional information the Commission would like to receive to assist in its consideration of the access alternatives. Provided below is a summary of the information and issues that Staff is currently working on:

1. Topographic and slope maps – The two alignments have been superimposed on topographic maps to illustrate the different topographic constraints of each option. Exhibit A includes the proposed alignments with aerial topography; Exhibit B superimposes the alignments on a slope map of the area. Discussion regarding such issues as slopes, grading, design, and constraints affecting both alternatives will be provided.
2. Fire Department review - The Fire Chief will provide emergency and safety analysis, identifying the criteria used for evaluating access for development projects and reviewing the proposed alignments for their implications to emergency access and emergency response times, including estimated response times from both the Sacramento and Maidu fire stations.
3. Police Department review – The Police Chief will provide information relating to police services.

4. Right-of-way acquisition and eminent domain – Both options would involve right of way acquisition from the Auburn Recreation District (ARD) and private property owner(s). The amount of land that would require acquisition under each alternative will be estimated. Potential issues associated with both options will be identified (e.g. the alignment for Alternative #4 may affect improvements on ARD property). Discussion will also be provided regarding eminent domain, since the City could be compelled to use eminent domain to acquire the property needed for the road right-of-way if the applicant is not successful in acquiring the needed property from the current owner.
5. Alignment, roadway, and bridge design information – Additional information will be provided regarding alignment options and implications (e.g. scope of work required within the UPRR right-of-way), roadway design (e.g. slope standards for roadway design), and bridge design.
6. Intersection improvements - Comparison of the likely improvements needed at the Auburn-Folsom Road intersections under the two access alternatives.
7. Infrastructure and services information – Staff will identify the infrastructure and services provided with each option, such as the water and storm drainage lines that would need to be incorporated and/or rerouted with each access, as well as services impacted by the proposed alignments (e.g. relocation of an existing 60kV power line for the Pacific Street extension).
8. Street lights – Due to the length of the road through an undeveloped area, staff will assess the need to provide street lighting.
9. Maintenance – The maintenance needs for both options will be provided.
10. Resource issues – Discussion will be provided about the implications of the alignment options on natural resources, cultural resources, and land use.
11. Costs - A general discussion of the relative costs of the access alternatives, including bridge construction, road construction, road maintenance, right-of-way acquisition and utilities.
12. CEQA implications – The need for additional CEQA analysis, if any, under either access alternative will be addressed.

OTHER INFORMATION

The Community Development Department is forwarding three pieces of correspondence addressed to the Planning Commission, including two letters from Sara Ann Ough (Attachments 3 & 4) and one email from applicant Stephen Des Jardins (Attachment 5). The correspondence is related to the BRSP project, but not to discussion of the two access alternatives. As noted above, the Planning Commission's review is limited to the access alternatives as directed by the City Council.

REQUESTED ACTION


The Community Development Department requests that the Planning Commission direct staff to continue with the site access information as discussed above, and to include any additional information as requested by the Planning Commission for their comparison of the access alternatives.

ATTACHMENTS

1. City Council Staff Report for January 13, 2011
2. Site Access Alternatives Map – January 10, 2010
3. Letter from Sara Ann Ough dated January 18, 2011
4. Letter from Sara Ann Ough dated January 22, 2011
5. Email from Applicant Stephen Des Jardins dated January 25, 2011
6. Site Access Summary Memo by Ubora Engineering dated January 27, 2011

EXHIBITS

- A. Site Access Alternatives Map – January 27, 2011




Report to the Auburn City Council

Action Item

Agenda Item No.

City Manager's Approval

To: Mayor and City Council Members
From: Reg Murray, Senior Planner 
Date: January 13, 2011
Subject: Appeal - Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan and Study Areas Project – File GPA 07-3; SPA 07-1; RE 07-1; SUB 07-2; DA-07-1

The Issue

Should the Auburn City Council deny the appeal submitted by Mark Smith and approve the Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan (BRSP) and Study Area project proposed for the 406-acre Urban Reserve area situated in southwest Auburn? Approval of the proposal includes certification of the project Environmental Impact Report (composed of the Draft and Final EIRs), adoption of the Mitigation Monitoring Program and the Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations, adoption of a Specific Plan (the BRSP), adoption of a General Plan Amendment, approval of a Rezone, approval of a Large Lot Tentative Map, approval of a Development Agreement, and adoption of Statement of Reasons for Permitting Development within a Mineral Resource Zone.

Conclusions and Recommendation

The Auburn Planning Commission recommends that the Auburn City Council take the following actions relating to the Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan and Study Areas Project:

- A. By Resolution, deny the appeal submitted by Mark Smith and take the following actions regarding the environmental document prepared for the Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan and Study Area Project:
 - a. Certify the Environmental Impact Report prepared for the Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan and Study Area project;
 - b. Adopt the Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations; and
 - c. Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring Program.
- B. By Resolution, approve the General Plan Amendment associated with the Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan and Study Area Project (File GPA 07-3).
- C. By Resolution, approve the Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan and Study Area Project (File SPA 07-1).

- D. By Motion, introduce and hold a first reading, by title only, of an ordinance approving the rezone for Plan Area 1 of the BRSP as well as Study Areas 1-4 of the Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan and Study Areas Project.
- E. By Motion, introduce and hold a first reading, by title only, of an ordinance approving a Development Agreement by and between the City of Auburn and the Baltimore Ravine Investors, LLC.
- F. By Resolution, deny the appeal submitted by Mark Smith and approve the Large Lot Tentative Map for Plan Area 1 of the Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan (File SUB 07-2) as presented, or as amended by the City Council.
- G. By Resolution, adopt the Statement of Reasons to Permit Development in a Mineral Resource Zone.

Background/Analysis

The Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan (BRSP) and Study Area Project is proposed for the 406-acre Urban Reserve area situated in southwest Auburn (Exhibit A - September 21, 2010 PC Binder). The project site is located in an area of the City designated by the Auburn General Plan as Urban Reserve. The Urban Reserve designation requires a Specific Plan prior to any development. The City received an application in mid-2007 to develop the Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan on approximately 277 acres of the 406-acre Urban Reserve area. The remaining 129 acres are not included within the BRSP area, but are designated Study Areas. The Study Areas are proposed to be redesignated Rural Density Residential (RDR) with a minimum 2 acres per dwelling unit.

The draft Specific Plan was made available to the public in October 2009. The City prepared a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Project and circulated the EIR to the public and government agencies from June 8 to July 23, 2010. A Final EIR was made available to commenting agencies and the public prior to the November 16, 2010, Planning Commission meeting.

The Auburn Planning Commission held a public hearing on September 21, 2010, to review the Project and accept public comment. The Commission continued the public hearing to November 16, 2010, at which time the Commission recommended to the City Council to approve the Project and associated actions. The Commission also certified the EIR and approved the Large Lot Tentative Map contingent on Council approval of the Project.

Prior Plans for the Urban Reserve

The Urban Reserve area has been the subject of several previous studies and development proposals, although none have been adopted to date.

- In 1969, the City expanded its boundaries to the west and annexed the Urban Reserve area into the City of Auburn.

- In 1978, the City prepared and certified an EIR that evaluated potential roadway access to 209 acres in the Urban Reserve area. No improvements or development occurred.
- In 1979, the plan area was designated Urban Reserve with the adoption of the 1979 General Plan in recognition that it could be developed at some point in the future and that the City wanted the area to be master planned.
- In 1985, the "Southwest Area Road Access Study" was prepared and evaluated roadway alternatives through the plan area to connect the portion of the site between I-80 and the westbound UPRR tracks.
- In 1987, the City approved the Vista del Valle #4 subdivision, which included dedication of right-of-way for the Herdal Drive extension.
- In 1988, the City received a proposal for the Auburn Vista Subdivision, a 33-acre parcel with 135 lots. This led to a preliminary draft of the Southwest Area Specific Plan in 1990. This specific plan area included 270 acres with a mix of residential, commercial/professional and open space uses. The plan provided for 1,056 dwelling units. The Southwest Area Specific Plan and accompanying Draft EIR were never completed or adopted by the City.
- In 1993, the Southwest Auburn Specific Plan was drafted which included 321 acres (including the Grand Oaks project area). This plan included up to 1,232 residential units, along with neighborhood commercial, pocket parks, and open space uses, with a portion remaining in urban reserve. An NOP was issued for this project plus up to 864 dwelling units in the Urban Reserve (for a total of 2,096 units) in 1994, but the project was put on hold in 1995.

Current Project Planning Process and Outreach

The current applicant submitted a proposal in 2007 to prepare the Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan, a master plan which would guide development of 277 acres of the Urban Reserve. A Notice of Preparation of an EIR for that proposal was released in December 2007, and the City held a scoping meeting on January 24, 2008. The BRSP proposal was subsequently revised by the applicant, responding in part to staff and community concerns. The revised BRSP also accounts for the natural topography of the site, which includes many steep hillsides and slopes. A second Notice of Preparation of an EIR for the revised proposal was released in April 2009.

The Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan was made available for public review in October 2009 (Exhibit B - September 21, 2010 PC Binder). An Addendum to the BRSP was released on July 7, 2010, which reflects revisions to the BRSP proposed by the applicant and staff (see Exhibit C - September 21, 2010 PC Binder).

Other activities related to the Project include:

- Planning Commission hearing (December 15, 2009): A public hearing was held to overview the contents of the draft BRSP and accept public comments on the proposed plan.

The staff report and minutes for the December 15th Planning Commission meeting are attached as Exhibits G and H of the September 21, 2010 PC Binder, respectively.

- Site Tours: Several tours of the BRSP area were held during March through May 2010 for Council members, Planning Commissioners and the public. The staff report prepared for the Site Tours is provided with Exhibit I of the September 21, 2010 PC Binder.

UAIC Consultation: The City and EIR consultants consulted with the United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) on a number of occasions. The City, the EIR consultant (PBS&J), representatives of UAIC, and UAIC consultants met to discuss the project. Representatives from the UAIC also participated in a site visit with City staff and consultants. Together, the group spent approximately 8 hours at the project site looking for Native American archaeological sites and artifacts. The City provided documents to the UAIC for review and answered questions regarding the project. The UAIC submitted a letter to the City on November 5, 2010 stating that the archaeological reports prepared for the project by the City's EIR consultant met federal and state standards, and that the UAIC concurred with the content, recommendations and mitigation measures included in the archaeological report and the Draft EIR (Attachment 2 of the November 16, 2010 PC Staff Report).

- Draft EIR (Exhibit D - September 21, 2010 PC Binder): The Draft EIR was prepared by the City and circulated from June 8 to July 23, 2010. A public hearing to accept comments on the adequacy of the Draft EIR was held on July 13, 2010. The staff report and draft minutes for the July 13th Planning Commission meeting are attached as Exhibits E and F, respectively, of the September 21, 2010 PC binder.
- Final EIR: Responses to comments received on the Draft EIR and a Mitigation Monitoring Program were incorporated into the Final EIR, which was provided to the public in November 2010 (Exhibit A - November 16, 2010 PC Hearing).
- Mineral Resource Zone Draft Statement of Reasons: A portion of the project site is designated MRZ-2b, recognizing the potential for gold deposits to be present. Public Resources Code Section 2762 requires that the City adopt a Statement of Reasons prior to permitting development in MRZ-2b areas. A notice of intent to permit development within the MRZ-2b area was sent to property owners within ½ mile of the project site, pursuant to PRC 2762. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on August 3, 2009 to take public comment on the draft Statement of Reasons. A copy of the staff report and the draft minutes from the August 3rd meeting are attached as Exhibits J and K, respectively, of the September 21, 2010 PC binder.
- Planning Commission hearing (September 21, 2010): The Planning Commission reviewed the Draft EIR and project approvals, and accepted public comment on the project.
- Planning Commission hearing (November 16, 2010): The Planning Commission accepted public testimony prior to recommending approval of the project, certifying the EIR and approving the Large Lot Tentative Map, contingent on Council approval of the project.

- City website: All of the above documents have been made available through the City's website, along with pertinent staff reports and notices (www.auburn.ca.gov).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Project would allow for development of up to a total of 790 residential units (725 units in the BRSP, with 270 units in Plan Area 1, 455 units in Future Plan Area 2, and 65 units in the Study Areas), 90,000 square feet of commercial/mixed-use space, 2 acres of park and 141 acres of open space. Table 1 below provides a breakdown of the Project by proposed land use. Details of the Project are discussed briefly below, followed by a summary of the required project entitlements.

TABLE 1 BALTIMORE RAVINE SPECIFIC PLAN LAND USE SUMMARY				
Land Use Designation	Applied Zoning District	Acres	Density Range	Dwelling Units
BALTIMORE RAVINE SPECIFIC PLAN				
Residential				
Low Density Residential (LDR)	R-1 (Single-Family Residential District)	12 acres	Up to 1 du/ac	11 du
Urban Low Density Residential (ULDR)	R-1 (Single-Family Residential District)	52 acres	1-4 du/ac	155 du
Medium Density Residential (MDR)	R-2 (Medium Density Multiple-Family Residential)	17 acres	1-10 du/ac	150 du
Urban High Density Residential (UHDR) ¹	R-4 (High Density Multiple-Family Residential)	11 acres	5-20 du/ac	180 du
Non Residential				
Mixed Use – High Density Residential/Commercial (HDR/COMM)	C-1 (Neighborhood Commercial) R-3 (Medium Density Multiple-Family Residential)	17 acres	floor area ratio up to 3 5-15 du/ac	50,000 sf 130 du
Mixed Use – Urban High Density Residential/Commercial (UHDR/COMM)	C-1 (Neighborhood Commercial) R-4 (High Density Multiple-Family Residential)	8 acres	floor area ratio up to 3 10-20 du/ac	30,000 sf 120 du
Mixed Use - Urban Low Density Residential/Commercial (ULDR/COMM)	C-1 (Neighborhood Commercial) R-1 (Single-Family Residential)	3 acres	floor area ratio up to 3 1-4 du/ac	10,000 sf 2 du
Park & Open Space				
Park	OS-C	2 acres		
Open Space	OS-C	141 acres		
Right of way (ROW)		14 acres		
Total		277 acres		725 du
Study Areas				
Study Area 1		32 acres	1du/2ac	16 du
Study Area 2		14 acres	1du/2ac	7 du
Study Area 3		36.5 acres	1du/2ac	19 du
Study Area 4		46.5 acres	1du/2ac	23 du
Total		129 acres		65 du
BRSP AND STUDY AREAS TOTAL		406 acres		790 du 90,000 sf

Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan

The Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan (Exhibit B of the September 21, 2010 PC Binder) establishes a framework for developing 270 acres of the Urban Reserve. The BRSP identifies land use designations, sets minimums and maximums for development within each land use, provides plans for circulation and utilities, includes standards and guidelines that will shape the character of development within the plan area, and addresses financing and implementation. In some cases, the requirements (e.g., design guidelines) are more detailed for Plan Area 1 than for Future Plan Area 2. The additional detail required for Future Plan Area 2 must be amended into the BRSP in the future before Future Plan Area 2 development can proceed.

The BRSP proposes a mix of residential and non-residential land uses to form a new residential community in the southwest area of Auburn. The majority of the BRSP area would be developed with residential uses that would include up to 725 new homes with a density range of 1 to 20 du/ac. In addition, the BRSP provides for development of up to 90,000 square feet of retail/commercial/mixed uses in Future Plan Area 2.

The land use plan provides for a community core in Future Plan Area 2, with a mix of commercial and residential uses (possibly including residential units over ground-floor retail along Herdal-Werner Connector) and a 2-acre park. The higher-density residential uses are generally placed in and around the community core, with lower-density residential uses located in the southern portion of the plan area, where in combination with open space, they provide separation from and a transition to the existing residences to the south of the plan area. Sidewalks and bike paths on the Herdal-Werner Connector and other primary streets would provide pedestrian and bicycle access to the commercial area and park.

The BRSP provides extensive open space areas, which frame the residential neighborhoods, provide separation from existing residences, preserve natural resources and provide a significant visual amenity. Over half of the plan area, approximately 141 acres, is proposed to be preserved in permanent open space. Unimproved dirt trails would be constructed in some areas. The open space areas would preserve the ravines, drainages and expanses of woodlands. Natural terrain would also be retained in some of the lower-density residential lots, as grading will be limited to only the front 80 to 100-feet of the lots.

The proposed project would require the extension of roads and services (water and sewer lines). Access would be provided by the extension of Herdal Drive, which would connect to Werner Road via the Herdal-Werner Connector. Two bridges would be constructed across the UPRR tracks, including a bridge across Bloomer Cut (Attachment 5.a) to serve this main access. In Plan Area 1, up to 5 model units could be constructed with the bridge over Bloomer Cut. Up to 75 units can be constructed with a connection to Rogers Lane. Prior to issuance of the 76th building permit, the Herdal-Werner Connector must be constructed, and project access to Rogers Lane will be closed off (Attachment 5.b). Werner Road, Rogers Lane and the Werner Road/Ophir Road intersection would be improved as part of the project. A connection from Plan Area 1 to Perry Ranch Road would provide emergency access, but no improvements would be made to Perry Ranch Road. Off-site water and sewer line extensions would occur within road rights-of-way. The connection of Herdal Drive to Werner Road (Attachment 5.c) would be required prior to the 76th building permit.

The BRSP provides several recreational amenities such as a small park, open space, bike lanes, and pedestrian trails. The BRSP also recognizes the importance of “Bloomer Cut” as well as other historic resources within the plan area by including a historical marker describing the events surrounding construction of the transcontinental railroad through the area as well as historic mining operations.

The BRSP identifies the anticipated sources of funding for BRSP improvements, including developer financing, the City’s sewer connection fee, the Auburn Recreation District Fee, and the County Capital Facilities Fee. Maintenance of landscape corridors, open space, drainage basins and trails would be funded through a homeowner’s association and/or landscape and lighting district.

The Development Standards in the BRSP identify the permitted uses within the BRSP, and specify the requirements for lot size and coverage, setbacks, building heights, and parking. Development standards for the zones that apply only to Future Plan Area 2 (e.g., commercial, R-3) are not part of the Development Standards and will be added to the BRSP at the time that development approvals are effectuated for Future Plan Area 2.

The BRSP also includes Design Guidelines, which provide direction for the physical form and visual character of the BRSP. The Guidelines, which utilize graphics and photographs to illustrate the application of guidelines in the plan area, are intended to encourage creativity in developing designs for public spaces and individual development projects. The Design Guidelines cover several aspects of development design:

- Common design elements throughout the plan area, such as streetscapes, landscaping, entrances, signs, walls and fencing, grading and street lighting.
- Site-specific Design Elements for certain features, such as Bloomer Cut, bridge design and retaining walls.
- Residential Architecture, including scale and massing, roof and window forms, porches, garages and exterior finishes.

These Guidelines are meant to be used in combination with the Development Standards and applicable City ordinances and regulations. Like the Development Standards, the Design Guidelines for Plan Area 1 are included in the BRSP at this time; additional Design Guidelines will be added to the BRSP at the time that development approvals are effectuated for Future Plan Area 2.

REQUESTED PROJECT APPROVALS

The key actions associated with the Project are:

1. **Denial of the Appeal to the Planning Commission Action:** The Planning Commission approved the Large Lot Tentative Map for Plan Area 1 of the BRSP, and certified the project EIR, at its public hearing on November 16, 2010. That decision was appealed by Mark Smith, an Auburn resident, on November 24, 2010 (Attachment 1). In the appeal,

Mr. Smith states that there is “a lack of incorporation of all previously approved variances and projects approved that impact Auburn and the region in terms of: (1) transportation and circulation (Table 5.11-7) and Luther Road/Dairy Road/Auburn-Ravine Road and Elm Avenue; (2) public services (schools, law enforcement, fire, parks); (3) public utilities (water supply-PCWA, PG&E, sewer); (4) hydrology and water quality; and (5) noise and vibration.” The appeal also states that “All of these impacts and changes, change the quality of life in Auburn.” No specific questions are raised with respect to the project and analysis of its impacts. The suggested remedy is an open space park preserve.

As discussed below, and throughout the record for the project, the impacts of the project have been thoroughly evaluated. The Draft EIR does analyze all of the issues listed in the appeal under both existing and future (or “cumulative”) conditions. For the traffic analysis, the cumulative condition was based on a growth rate of 1.7 percent over 20 years, which would account for buildout of the General Plan, including current approvals. Several of the streets cited in the appeal—Luther Road, Dairy Road and Elm Avenue—are not in the project vicinity, and would not provide a direct connection between the project and other major roads, so they were not included in the traffic analysis. Impacts on Auburn-Folsom Road were evaluated in the Draft EIR.

The proposed remedy of designating the plan area an “open space park reserve” would not be consistent with the General Plan designation of Urban Reserve, which recognizes that the plan area would be subject to development at some time. Further, no agency, such as the Auburn Recreation District (ARD), has indicated an interest in purchasing all or part of the plan area for use as a park. Given current fiscal conditions, it is unlikely that ARD or the City would have the financial resources needed to purchase and/or develop an open space preserve or park the size of the Urban Reserve, so this option does not appear to be feasible.

2. **Project Environmental Document** – Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, the City Council must take several actions related to the environmental analysis and process prior to considering the project (Exhibit A) which includes the following:
 - a. Certification of the BRSP Environmental Impact Report, including the Draft EIR (Exhibit D - September 21, 2010 PC Binder) and the Final EIR (Exhibit A - November 16, 2010 staff report).
 - b. Adoption of the Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations (Exhibit A - November 16, 2010 staff report).
 - c. Adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring Program (Exhibit A - November 16, 2010 staff report).
3. **General Plan Amendment** – A General Plan Amendment (Exhibit B) is required to address the following:
 - a. The existing Urban Reserve designation in the south Auburn area must be replaced with the land use designations proposed in the BRSP (Exhibit L.1 and L.2, respectively, of the September 21, 2010 PC Binder). The Auburn General Plan requires the adoption of a specific plan in order to change the Urban Reserve

- designations. Adoption of a specific plan (e.g. the BRSP) is conducted by amending the General Plan. The General Plan Amendment for this plan (Exhibit B) will adopt the BRSP land use designations for Plan Area 1. Plan Area 2 would retain the Urban Reserve designation until future development approvals are undertaken for that area. The General Plan amendment also re-designates the remainder of the Urban Reserve area not in Plan Areas 1 or 2 (i.e. Study Areas 1, 2, 3, and 4) as Rural Density Residential with a 2-acre lot minimum (RDR – 0.5 du/ac).
- b. Adopt a new Urban High Density Residential (UHDR) designation: The BRSP includes a new land use designation, Urban High Density Residential (UHDR). The UHDR designation is not recognized in the current General Plan. The existing General Plan includes a High Density Residential designation (HDR) that allows for up to 15 units per acre. In order to provide for higher, more urban densities, approximately 18 acres in Plan Area 2 would be designated Urban High Density Residential (UHDR), which would allow for 10 to 20 units per acre. In order to include the UHDR designation in the BRSP, the General Plan must be amended to add the UHDR designation. Allowing up to 20 units per acre is consistent with the 2008 Auburn Housing Element.
4. **Specific Plan** – The Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan proposed by the applicant, as amended by the addendum (Exhibits B and C, respectively, of the September 21, 2010 PC Binder).
5. **Rezone** – Plan Area 1 and the four Study Areas must be rezoned in association with the BRSP (Exhibit D). Plan Area 1 will be rezoned consistent with the BRSP, while the Study Areas will be rezoned to Agricultural Residential with 2-acre lot size minimums (AR-2). The property in Future Plan Area 2 will retain its current zoning. The existing and proposed zones are shown in Exhibits M.1 and M.2, respectively, of the September 21, 2010 PC Binder.
6. **Large Lot Tentative Map** – A Large Lot Tentative Map is proposed for Plan Area 1 (Exhibit F). The configuration of the lots is consistent with the parcel configuration illustrated by the land use plan in the BRSP. This tentative map was approved by the Planning Commission on November 16, 2010, however, the City Council must act on the map due to the appeal of the Planning Commission's action.
7. **Development Agreement** – A development agreement (DA) is proposed for Plan Area 1 in conjunction with the BRSP. The development agreement formalizes the requirements and expectations between the City and the applicant (Baltimore Ravine Investors, LLC) as well as future developers, including the timing of improvements and insuring that the City is "made whole" in regards to impacts, fees, and costs associated with the BRSP. The draft DA is provided as Exhibit O of the September 21st Planning Commission report, as amended by the deal points identified in the November 16th memo to the Commission. The final development agreement is currently being revised by the City Attorney to include the deal points and will be provided to the City Council prior to the Council hearing.

8. **Statement of Reasons to Permit Development in a Mineral Resource Zone** – A portion of the plan area has been designated a Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) by the State geologist. State law requires that the City adopt, and the State Board of Mines and Geology approve, a Statement of Reasons for permitting development in an area that has been identified as an MRZ. If adopted by the City Council, staff will forward the Statement of Reasons (Exhibit G) to the State Board for their approval.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

As stated above, the Planning Commission approved the Large Lot Tentative Map and certified the EIR at their November 16, 2010, meeting. The Commission also recommended that the City Council approve the other components of the Project listed above. Public comment received during the September 21, 2010 and November 16, 2010 public hearings are provided with draft Commission minutes (Attachments 2 and 3). The observations made by the Planning Commission are provided in the draft minutes of November 16, 2010 (Attachment 3) and are summarized below:

- Commissioner Worthington acknowledged all of the questions raised by the public and Commission throughout the various hearings and expressed that all of the project concerns had been thoroughly addressed by staff.
- Commissioner Young recognized that the proposed project would increase traffic for the existing Herdal neighborhood, and expressed concern about protecting the integrity of Bloomer Cut as a historic resource. However, Commissioner Young stated that the Herdal access was the best approach for the project as it provided safe and efficient access to the plan area.
- Commissioner Snyder stated that his most significant was access, but that based on thorough review of the issue, the Herdal Drive access was the logical point of access to the project. Commissioner Snyder noted concerns expressed about the possible financial impacts of the project, but that the development agreement insures that the project will provide all required fees to insure that the City isn't subsidizing the project. He also commented that the project has certain benefits, such as introducing younger families with into the community, which should help counter the declining enrollment in our schools.
- Chair Spokely commented that the access issue was his primary concern as well, but based on the extensive analysis given the issue, it is clear that the Herdal access is the best point of access to the plan area. He stated his concern about the crossing of Bloomer Cut with the Herdal extension, but is excited that the project will make it available for others to experience. Chair Spokely noted that the project fully pays for itself, and was impressed that the project received the endorsement of the Sierra Club.

The Planning Commission voted 4-0 (Commissioner Vitas recused himself due to a possible conflict of interest) to certify the EIR for the project and approved the large lot tentative map for Plan Area 1. The Planning Commission also recommended that the Auburn City Council

approve the General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan, Rezone, Development Agreement, and Statement of Reasons for the MRZ.

CONCERNS RAISED TO DATE

A variety of concerns about the Project have been raised at hearings and in response to the Environmental Impact Report. Public concerns generally fall into the following categories, which are discussed below:

1. Increased development in the City of Auburn
2. Changes to the small-town character of Auburn
3. Increased traffic congestion, specifically
 - a. Auburn-Folsom Road
 - b. Herdal Drive
 - c. Indian Hill Road
4. Access Options
5. Bridging of Bloomer Cut
6. Native American resources and consultation
7. Wildlife
8. Traffic noise

1. Increased Development in the City of Auburn

Some members of the public have expressed concern about increased growth and development in Auburn, particularly on the scale proposed in the BRSP. In response, the City is expected to grow over time, with or without the BRSP. SACOG projects that the City's population will grow from approximately 13,500 residents in 2009 to approximately 18,000 by 2035, an increase of about 33 percent. If approved, the BRSP would provide residences and commercial services for a portion of this increased population. Further, the Urban Reserve has been identified as an area for potential growth since the 1978 General Plan, and is the last large, contiguous undeveloped area in the City. The size of the BRSP is the result in part of the acreage to be developed.

2. Changes to the Small-town Character of Auburn

Concern has been expressed that the BRSP would alter the small town character of Auburn, and that the BRSP is not compatible with the character of Auburn. In response, the proposed project is consistent with the densities of development found throughout the City. With the exception of the proposed 20 du/acre zone, the densities in the BRSP are similar to those found elsewhere in Auburn, with lower density residential development occurring near the Urban Reserve, and higher density and mixed-use development occurring in Old Town, downtown and some of the more commercial areas of the City. The community core in Future Plan Area 2 is intended to create a small-scale neighborhood. The BRSP would increase traffic levels on local roadways, which could be perceived as changing the character of areas that have low traffic volumes at present. However, Project traffic would be directed toward major roads, such as Auburn-Folsom and Indian Hill, and would generally not travel through existing residential streets. With the exception of road improvements, the BRSP would not alter existing neighborhoods, Old Town, downtown or other areas characteristic of Auburn.

3. Increased Traffic Congestion

The BRSP would increase traffic volumes on the local street network. The traffic study prepared for the EIR evaluated the effect of the Project on roadway segments and intersections in the City of Auburn and Placer County, as well as Interstate 80 under both existing and cumulative conditions (roughly twenty years in the future). At some locations, the Project was found to create or exacerbate poor levels of service. However, the Project will be required to implement mitigation measures to improve conditions at these locations. The identified improvements would result in acceptable conditions at all of the study segments and facilities. A caveat is made for improvements to the Interstate 80/Newcastle Ramp intersection, because the recommended improvements are the jurisdiction of Caltrans and/or Placer County, and the City cannot guarantee that the improvements will be installed. If the recommended improvements are installed, however, the intersection operations would be acceptable.

3a. Auburn-Folsom Road

Some comments compared future traffic levels on Auburn-Folsom Road to those currently experienced on Highway 49. In response, even with full occupancy of the BRSP, the volume of traffic on Auburn Folsom Road will remain far below that reported today on SR 49. While the raw traffic volume is not itself a measure of significance, as shown in Table 2, current volumes on SR 49 will remain more than twice the volumes forecast for Auburn Folsom Road with the Project (i.e. existing plus BRSP volumes).

TABLE 2 COMPARISON OF PEAK HOUR SEGMENT VOLUMES ON SR 49 AND ON AUBURN FOLSOM ROAD				
Street	From	To	Peak Hour Volume	
			AM	PM
Existing Conditions				
Auburn Folsom Rd	Maidu Dr	Herdal Drive	1,225	1,330
Auburn Folsom Rd	Herdal Dr	Sacramento St (N)	1,180	1,260
Grass Valley Hwy	Lincoln Way	EB I-80 ramps	1,580	1,560
Grass Valley Hwy	WB I-80 ramps	Elm Avenue	2,595*	2,675*
Grass Valley Hwy	Dorothy Way	Marguerite Mine Rd	2,527*	2,482*
Grass Valley Hwy	Live Oak Ln	Luther Rd	2,773*	3,264*
Existing Plus BRSP Area 1				
Auburn Folsom Rd	Maidu Drive	Herdal Drive	1,225	1,330
		project only	105	130
		total	1,330	1,460
Auburn Folsom Rd	Herdal Drive	Sacramento St (N)	1,180	1,260
		Project only	70	85
		Total	1,250	1,345
Existing Plus BRSP Build Out (1 & 2)				
Auburn Folsom Rd	Maidu Dr	Herdal Road	1,225	1,330

		Project only	200	520
		Total	1,425	1,850
Auburn Folsom Rd	Herdal Drive	Sacramento St (N)	1,180	1,260
		Project only	105	135
		Total	1,285	1,395
* SR 49 data from Placer County's Bohemia Center DEIR				

3b. Herdal Drive Traffic Impacts

As discussed above, there would be two primary access point for the Project - Werner Road and Herdal Drive. Initially, Herdal Drive would provide primary access to Plan Area 1, and secondary access would be provided via Rogers Lane. Project traffic on Herdal Drive with Plan Area 1 only is estimated to be 2,150 daily vehicle trips. At buildout of both Plan Area 1 and Future Plan Area 2, 40 percent of BRSP residential traffic is expected to use the Werner Road access, and 60 percent of residential project traffic and 95 percent of project retail traffic, a total of 8,740 daily vehicle trips, is expected to use Herdal Drive. As stated above, Herdal Drive has the capacity to accommodate these traffic levels.

The Draft EIR evaluated levels of service at the intersections of Herdal Drive with Auburn-Folsom Road, Del Valle Drive and Quinn Way. Under existing conditions plus project traffic, the intersections of Herdal Drive/Del Valle Drive and Herdal Drive/Quinn Way would operate within City service level standards. The Herdal Drive/Auburn-Folsom Road intersection would also meet City standards under existing conditions with Plan Area 1 traffic. However, under both existing and cumulative conditions, the intersection of Herdal Drive and Auburn-Folsom Road is projected to operate at LOS E in the p.m. peak hour as the result of the addition of full BRSP traffic (both Plan Area 1 and Future Plan Area 2). Mitigation Measure 5.11-1 on page 5.11-59 of the Draft EIR requires re-striping the eastbound Herdal Drive approach to provide a separate left turn lane; no changes are required to the striping on Auburn-Folsom Road at this intersection. With the mitigation identified above, the service level at the Auburn-Folsom Road/Herdal Drive intersection would improve to LOS D in the p.m. peak hour, which would satisfy minimum City of Auburn standards.

The impacts on residents of Herdal Drive and the Herdal Drive extension are evaluated throughout the Draft EIR. For example, the visual impacts on the Herdal Drive extension are specifically addressed on page 5.1-37 in Impact 5.1-1, noise impacts on residents of Herdal Drive and the extension are addressed in Impacts 5.8-1 (page 5.8-24) and 5.9-7 (pages 5.8-33 and 5.8-34) and the traffic impacts on Herdal Drive are analyzed in Impacts 5.11-1 (pages 5.11-58 and -59) and 5.11-6 (pages 5.11-63 and -64). In addition, subsequent to the Draft EIR, more specific information regarding the topography of the extension and adjacent residences has allowed the City's noise consultant to prepare detailed analyses of the noise impacts on those properties (see Attachment 1 – November 16, 2010 PC Report).

3c. Indian Hill Road Traffic Impacts

The project would not provide a direct connection to Indian Hill Road, but some project traffic would use this roadway. The Draft EIR analyzed traffic conditions on Indian Hill Road from its

intersection with Auburn-Folsom Road to Interstate 80, and found that the road would meet City and County service level criteria with or without the addition of project traffic. In addition, the Draft EIR looked at service levels at three intersections with Indian Hill Road: Auburn-Folsom Road, Dillon Circle and Dillon Circle/Hoyer Lane. The Final EIR also estimated the service levels at the intersection with Grandview Drive, which serves the Grand Oaks subdivision and Indian Hill Estates subdivision. All of the intersections that were studied would meet the service level standards. Consequently, the project was found to have a less-than-significant impact at these intersections.

One of the concerns expressed by the public regarding traffic on Indian Hill Road is safety at the Indian Hill Road/Hoyer Lane intersection due to a fatal accident that occurred at this location 10 years ago. Concerns about the intersection were reviewed on page 5.11-1 of the Draft EIR and addressed in more detail in an assessment summarized in Appendix N.10. The assessment reviewed accident records for the period of 2002-2006, a time frame that is consistent with standard practice for traffic safety studies, and determined that three accidents had occurred over that time period, of which one resulted in an injury. The assessment, which acknowledged the fatal accident that had occurred at the intersection, concluded that various types of accidents had occurred and that there were no conditions at the intersection that would be directly affected by the development of the BRSP. The Draft EIR noted that the intersection is within the jurisdiction of Placer County and that any action to improve the intersection would have to be made by the County.

4. Access Options

Development of the BRSP requires at least two 24-hour, unrestricted access points. The project applicant proposes to provide the required accesses by connecting Herdal Drive to Werner Road, which will require two new bridges over the UPRR tracks and the construction of a new road through the BRSP. Concerns have been raised about the southern access, which would extend Herdal Drive and construct a bridge over the UPRR rail line at Bloomer Cut.

Prior projects proposed for the Urban Reserve, which includes the BRSP area, have also had to grapple with the issue of access. A number of options have been considered in the past (see Page 2 above; Prior Plans for the Urban Reserve). The prior circulation plans for the Urban Reserve area have, for the most part, assumed that both tracks would need to be crossed, and that the crossings would be placed at locations similar to those proposed in the BRSP. A crossing at Bloomer Cut has been assumed as a primary crossing or an option in all of the plans that were reviewed. Both Maidu Drive and Herdal Drive have been considered as routes to connect the Bloomer Cut crossing to Auburn-Folsom Road. Other access points have been proposed, including connections to Pacific Street and High Street, particularly in the 1993 Southwest Auburn Specific Plan, which provided for connection to these streets in addition to (not instead of) the primary routes via Indian Hill Road and Werner Road.

In March 2010, staff prepared a memorandum (Exhibit R; September 21, 2010 PC Binder) discussing the various access routes that had been considered in the past or suggested during hearings for the BRSP. Since that time, additional analysis has been conducted to compare the area that would be disturbed by each alternative, including a rough estimate of the amount of woodlands that would be lost (Attachment 4; this report). An additional alternative, using the

PG&E powerline corridor that intersects with Tea Lane, was suggested in comments on the Draft EIR, and is also evaluated in Exhibit S of the September 21, 2010 PC Binder. The access alternatives that were reviewed are discussed briefly below:

- a. Herdal Drive extension: As with prior plans, Bloomer Cut was considered an optimal point at which to cross the rail line because it would require minimal grade changes and a relatively short-span bridge (approximately 70-feet) to clear the existing Bloomer Cut. The 70-foot bridge span is required by UPRR and would provide enough clearance to accommodate the addition of a second track should UPRR decide to construct one.

This route would add traffic through an existing neighborhood, but this was anticipated when the residential development was approved. Impacts on natural resources would be minimal compared to other options because the new road would be relatively short (less than 1,000 feet) and would travel through an area that is already disturbed (the City right-of-way) and/or composed primarily of grasslands. Approximately 0.9 acres would be disturbed, including approximately 0.5 acres of woodland. In addition to the physical advantages, the City owns the right-of-way for the Herdal Drive extension, and one of the parcels in Plan Area 1 (the Chevreux parcel), has an access easement on the extension.

- b. Maidu Drive extension: This was one of the options considered in prior plans, including the SWASP. Compared to the Herdal option, this option would require a longer road extension (approximately 1,300 feet) and right-of-way acquisition for the entire length. Like the Herdal Drive extension, this option would construct a bridge over Bloomer Cut. Because of the topography, however, portions of the area would need to be filled and the bridge would need a longer span (approximately 400 feet). Like the Herdal Drive extension, this option would place the new roadway adjacent to existing backyards of residences. In addition, the Maidu Drive extension would require fill of a wetland area, necessitating approval from the US Army Corps of Engineers through the Section 404 permit process. The road would also be constructed through a designated Open Space area that is under separate ownership. The area that would be disturbed would be approximately 2 to 3 acres, including 1 to 2 acres of woodland. Consequently, the impact on natural resources would be greater than the Herdal Drive extension.

- c. May Perry Drive: Under this option, a new road would connect to Auburn-Folsom Road north of the rail line, and extend southward, through the ARD recreation area, more or less parallel to the rail line. No crossing of the rail line would be required under this option, so Bloomer Cut would be unaffected; however, the roadway constructed for this option would traverse two ravines, requiring bridge crossings for each. It would require right-of-way acquisition for the approximately 2,000 feet that lie outside of the BRSP area. The roadway would be approximately 4,500 feet long, much of which would travel through woodlands, so it would require more tree removal than the Herdal Drive extension. This option would affect 6-10 acres, including 4-7 acres of woodlands. This option would also bisect Recreation Park and affect the ARD facilities thereon. The costs of this option could be relatively high due to the length of the road (which would include utilities), mitigation for loss of trees, impacts to Recreation Park, acquisition of right-of-way, and the construction of two bridges to cross two ravines.

- d. Pacific Street extension: Under this option, Pacific Street would be extended from Auburn-Folsom Road west over the rail line and then turn south to the northeast corner of the BRSP area. The roadway would be a total of approximately 3,500 feet long. In order to bridge the tracks, a 30-foot high roadway embankment would be required, generating a lot of fill. The rail line bridge would need to span approximately 150 to 200 feet, which would be longer than the Bloomer Cut bridge (70 feet), but not as long as a bridge from Maidu Drive (400 feet). The roadway embankment fill would need to extend onto the ARD property where it would then ramp down to meet existing ground elevation on the west side of the tracks. This option would need to acquire $\pm 1,000$ feet of right-of-way and would disturb 5-8 acres, of which 4-7 acres would be woodland.
- e. Rail line crossing south of Pacific Street: This option would provide a connection to Auburn-Folsom Road approximately 400 feet south of Pacific Street, near the existing Boardman canal. The total roadway length would be approximately 3,000 feet. An elevated bridge crossing would be required to provide adequate clearance, resulting in significant grading for bridge approaches and a longer bridge span (approximately 200 feet) than the Herdal Drive option. Within the BRSP area, the alignment would be similar to the May Perry and Pacific Street options, so there would need to be significant grading and two additional bridge crossings across two ravines. Approximately 4 to 7 acres would be disturbed, including approximately 3 to 5 acres of woodlands.
- f. High Street extension: High Street terminates in the Woodland Estates subdivision, immediately north of Study Area 3 and west of the northern rail line. This area is fairly steep; High Street has a 15% grade at its terminus. A connection between High Street and Future Plan Area 2 would require multiple switchbacks with steep grades and a bridge over the ravine. The ravine is located approximately 130 feet (in elevation) below the terminus of High Street, so the grade would be fairly steep. The area is heavily wooded, so there would be extensive impacts on trees. This connection would also route BRSP traffic through an older area of the City with relatively narrow residential streets.
- g. Tea Lane: A comment on the Draft EIR suggested that access could be provided to Plan Area 1 via Tea Lane, which intersects with Indian Hill Road at the same point as the PG&E transmission lines. The access road would extend north from the existing Indian Hill/Tea Lane intersection, following the transmission line easement across Dutch Ravine to Perry Ranch Road. Approximately 300 feet of Perry Ranch Road would then need to be widened and improved to provide access to Plan Area 1. This alignment would travel through two residential parcels, and would likely require the removal of at least one out building. It would not be feasible to build the road within the transmission line easement due conflicts with existing improvements (i.e. existing service towers within the easement), the development standards required by PG&E for improvements within the easement (e.g. PG&E would require a minimum setback from the towers to the road of at least 25 feet), and the City's standards for road improvements. As such, a road to City standards would not fit within the existing easement. One tower in the powerline easement is located approximately 150 feet from Indian Hill Road, so it would be difficult to for the access road to connect to Tea Lane and follow an alignment adjacent to the powerline. Also, a connection onto Indian Hill Road between Tea Lane and Sawka Road would not meet the City's spacing requirements.

If an alignment that connected with Tea Lane could be found, there would still be major disadvantages to using this approach. Because of the topography north of Indian Hill Road, this option would require an extremely long bridge span ($\pm 1,000'$) and it would disturb approximately 2-3 acres, of which 1-2 acres would be woodlands. In addition, $\pm 2,400$ linear feet of right-of-way would need to be obtained, and permission would be required to improve and use a portion of Perry Ranch Road since it is a private road. The connectivity (for emergency service) provided by this access would also be less advantageous when compared to the very direct route afforded by Hermal Drive

As explained in Exhibit R of the September 21, 2010 PC Binder, staff concurs that the Hermal Drive extension with the bridge over Bloomer Cut is the most appropriate means of providing access to the southern portion of the BRSP. The extension of Hermal Drive has been part of plans for providing access to the Baltimore Ravine area for more than 30 years, as evidenced by prior plans and the existing right-of-way on the extension. It is the most direct route, involving the least amount of roadway construction, and the shortest bridge span. The amount of cut and fill necessary for this route, and the impacts on natural resources, including woodlands, would be less severe than under other options. The primary disadvantages are that the roadway would be located adjacent to existing backyards and that the bridge would be constructed over a significant historic resource, Bloomer Cut. However, the extension has been anticipated for a number of years, including the approvals for the existing residences, and the bridge would be designed so that Bloomer Cut itself would not be altered.

5. Bridging of Bloomer Cut

Bloomer Cut is a significant historic railroad feature. With the construction of the Hermal Extension, the Project would not alter Bloomer Cut itself, but would span the cut with a new bridge. Currently, the area immediately adjacent to Bloomer Cut is undeveloped, so a new bridge would change the setting of the cut. The Draft EIR evaluates the impacts of bridging Bloomer Cut, and concludes that while the bridge would alter the setting, Bloomer Cut would still be considered a significant historic resource because it would continue to meet the criteria for eligibility for the National Register of Historic Resources (a standard method of determining whether a site or feature is historically significant).

In their comments on the Draft EIR, the Placer County Museum and the Placer County Historical Society, as well as several individuals, disagreed with the conclusions of the EIR, and stated that Bloomer Cut should not be bridged. Their comments have been addressed in the Final EIR.

The Draft EIR analysis of Bloomer Cut was conducted by qualified historians, and staff concurs with the findings. It should be noted that even though Bloomer Cut is considered eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, the ultimate determination of eligibility would be up to the Office of Historic Resources if the cut were nominated to the NRHP. However, nomination requires the involvement of the property owner, in this case Union Pacific, which has indicated that it would not pursue such an action.

6. Native American Resources and Consultation

Extensive historic and pre-historic research was conducted for the project site as part of the EIR analysis. PBS&J staff conducted a reconnaissance survey of the site, an intensive archaeological

pedestrian survey of the site, and invited representatives from the United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) to visit the site. At the request of the UAIC, the persons consulted included three cultural resource specialists from AES, Dr. Shelley McGinnis, Mike Taggart, and Yolanda Chavez, and two Native Americans, Allen E. Adams, and Grayson Coney. Mr. Adams is a UAIC Tribal member. Mr. Coney is not a member of the tribe, but he grew up in the Auburn area and is the Cultural Director of the Tsi-Akim Maidu Tribe in Grass Valley. Together, the group spent approximately 8 hours at the project site looking for Native American archaeological sites and artifacts.

It is known that the project area was inhabited during prehistoric and historic-period times, and buried human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, could be located on the project site. Archival research and the intensive onsite pedestrian survey did not disclose any specific burial locations in the project site. Research of death certificates is not conducted during archival research regarding archaeological sites. However, a recent review of historic death records on-line in Placer County did identify two death certificates from Bloomer Ranch in the late 1800s, although the burial location was not indicated. Because there is the potential that human remains could exist on the project site, mitigation was provided (Mitigation Measure 5.4-6 in the DEIR) that describes the procedures to be followed if human remains are encountered.

7. Wildlife

Concern was expressed about the displacement and loss of wildlife and trees. The plan area includes undeveloped woodlands and grasslands that provide habitat for a number of plant and animal species. The BRSP designates over half of the Specific Plan area as Open Space, which would be relatively undisturbed, and therefore would continue to provide habitat for resident species. Nonetheless, development of the site would convert a large portion of this habitat to urban uses, which would not be compatible with all of the species currently within the site. In some cases, particularly with birds, the displaced animals could move into areas designated open space or other nearby undeveloped areas. Other individual animals or plants would be lost to development. For the most part, the affected wildlife would be common species, such as deer, turkeys, small mammals and other birds.

The Draft EIR identified several special-status species plant and animal species (that is, those that are on State or federal lists of rare, threatened and endangered species), that could occur within the Urban Reserve, and provided mitigation to protect them.

8. Traffic Noise

The Project will increase traffic volumes on local roadways, which may also increase traffic noise levels. A noise study was prepared and determined that the increased noise would not exceed identified thresholds on most of the roads that were studied. Noise levels on Herdal Drive, the Herdal Drive extension and Werner Road would exceed thresholds, but the Draft EIR identifies mitigation (i.e. sound walls; pavement treatments) that would bring noise levels down to acceptable levels.

Herdal Drive Extension Impacts

Residents of the neighborhoods immediately north and south of Herdal Drive and the Herdal Drive extension have been particularly concerned about the use of Herdal Drive as the primary access to Plan Area 1. The backyards of fifteen (15) homes currently abut the Herdal Drive extension right-of-way; ten of those properties abut the south side of the right-of-way, while five abut the north side of the right-of-way. The properties to the south all are at elevations below the existing right-of-way and proposed road, while the properties to the north all have elevations higher than the existing right-of-way and proposed road.

The development of the BRSP will result in a definite change in the character of this area by constructing a road that will be used for one of the primary accesses to the BRSP. Because of this change and the concerns of the affected residents, a number of analyses have been prepared at a greater level of detail than normally conducted at this point in the approval process. The Draft EIR analyzes the effects of the project along the Herdal Drive extension, particularly for traffic, noise, visual quality, biological resources, and visual resources, based on field surveys and modeling at a level of detail typical for a project-specific EIR on a Specific Plan. For example, the Draft EIR includes a parcel by parcel analysis of traffic noise levels along the extension. Staff has also met with some of the residents, including the President of an adjacent homeowners association. One of the meetings was held in the field and included a walk of the alignment for the extension.

Since the Draft EIR was released, the applicant has provided additional detail regarding the design of the road relative to adjacent properties. A number of survey points have been collected in the field and used to refine the profile and elevation information for the road design. Cross-sections have been prepared at a number of locations showing the roadway elevation, soundwalls and adjacent parcels in order to better understand the effects on specific residences. The cross-sections are attached as Exhibit Q of the September 21, 2010 PC Binder.

Cross-section views were provided for each of the five properties abutting the north right-of-way, where the parcels are higher in elevation than the road right-of-way. Three cross-sections were provided for one of those parcels. These cross-sections were used by the City's noise consultant to evaluate the impacts to those properties given the estimated increase in traffic to be generated by the project. The information was also provided to the owners of several of the abutting properties at their request. Feedback was provided by a couple of those owners suggesting that the information provided was less than accurate.

In response, the applicant's surveyor obtained additional topographic information to confirm the accuracy of the data presented. The additional data was limited to the right-of-way due to access issues. City staff worked with the applicant and property owner representatives to obtain permission for the applicant's surveyor to enter the backyards of the abutting properties (in order to obtain additional data for those areas), but the necessary permission was not provided. Surveyors were allowed access to one backyard, 10940 Oak View Terrace, which has the most diverse topography of the lots abutting the extension, so additional analysis was conducted for this parcel. To address the topography in this area, the applicant proposes to drop the road elevation along the rear of 10940 Oak View Terrace by approximately 2 feet and to increase the

height of the wall to 8 feet (as opposed to 7 feet along the remainder of the road) to provide additional shielding from noise.

Additional noise analysis was conducted for the Herdal Extension to address these changes (Attachment 1 – November 16, 2010 PC Staff Report). The additional analysis reinforces the Draft EIR's conclusion that noise impacts would be less than significant with the application of mitigation for all of the adjacent parcels along the extension.

Alternatives Available to Council; Implications of Alternatives

- Deny the appeal and approve the project as presented, or as modified by the City Council.
- Approve the appeal and deny the project subject to findings as developed by the City Council.
- Continue the request for staff to provide additional information for Council consideration.

Fiscal Impacts

No significant fiscal impacts are anticipated. The development of the BRSP will be "at cost" as guaranteed through the Development Agreement. Maintenance of open space and private common areas will be the responsibility of home owner's association(s). The provision of services (e.g. fire; police) and the maintenance of public areas (e.g. public rights of way) will be paid for through an annual assessment on the property owners within the BRSP.

Additional Information

Copies of all documents referenced in this report are maintained by, and are available for review in, the Auburn Community Development Department. Please contact (530) 823-4211 ext 135 with questions.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Appeal Application by Mark Smith dated November 24, 2010
2. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes – September 21, 2010
3. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes – November 16, 2010
4. Access Comparison
5. Access Illustrations -
 - a. Access for 1 to 5 Units
 - b. Access for 6 to 75 Units
 - c. Access for 75+ Units

EXHIBITS

- A. Resolution – Certification of EIR (Draft EIR + Final EIR); Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations; and Mitigation Monitoring Program for the Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan and Study Areas Project
- B. Resolution – General Plan Amendment for the BRSP, Plan Area 1, and Study Areas

- C. Resolution – Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan
- D. Ordinance – Rezone for BRSP Plan Area 1 and Study Areas 1-4
- E. Ordinance – Development Agreement with Baltimore Ravine Investors LLC for BRSP Plan Area 1
- F. Resolution – Large Lot Tentative Map for Plan Area 1
- G. Resolution – Statement of Reasons to Permit Development in a Mineral Resource Zone

DOCUMENTS – SEPTEMBER 21, 2010 PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING:

- A. Project Location and Features
- B. Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan (provided separately)
- C. Addendum to the BRSP – July 7, 2010
- D. Draft EIR for the BRSP and Study Area Project (provided separately)
- E. Planning Commission Staff Report for DEIR review – July 13, 2010
- F. Planning Commission Minutes for DEIR review (draft) – July 13, 2010
- G. Planning Commission Staff Report – December 15, 2009
- H. Planning Commission Minutes – December 15, 2009
- I. Planning Commission Staff Report for Site Tours – March 26, 2010
- J. Planning Commission Staff Report for MRZ-2b review – August 3, 2010
- K. Planning Commission Minutes for MRZ-2b review (draft) – August 3, 2010
- L.
 - 1. Existing General Plan Land Use Designations
 - 2. Proposed General Plan Land Use Designations
- M.
 - 1. Existing Zoning
 - 2. Proposed Zoning
- N. Large Lot Tentative Map
- O. Draft Development Agreement
- P. MRZ Statement of Reasons
- Q. Herdal Drive Extension Cross-Sections
- R. Staff Memorandum regarding BRSP Access – March 26, 2010
- S. Uhora Memorandum regarding BRSP Access – September 1, 2010

DOCUMENTS – NOVEMBER 16, 2010 PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING:

ATTACHMENTS

- 1. Supplemental Noise Analysis – 10940 Oak View Terrace
- 2. UAIC Letter from Tribal Administrator Greg Baker dated November 5, 2010
- 3. Letter from Alex Fisch dated October 23, 2010

EXHIBITS

- A. Planning Commission **Resolution 10-12** certifying the project environmental documents including the following:
 - 1. Draft EIR for the BRSP and Study Area Project (provided separately)

2. Final EIR and Mitigation Monitoring Program (attached)
 3. Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations (attached)
- B. Planning Commission **Resolution 10-13** recommending approval of the General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan Amendment, Rezone, and Development Agreement (Files GPA 07-3; SPA 07-1; RE 07-1; and DA 07-1), including the following:
1. Proposed General Plan Land Use Designations.
 2. Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan (provided separately)
 3. Addendum to the BRSP – July 7, 2010 (Exhibit C of the September 21st staff report)
 4. Proposed Zoning
 5. Development Agreement (Exhibit O of the September 21st staff report)
- C. Planning Commission **Resolution 10-14** approving the Large Lot Tentative Map for BRSP Plan Area 1.
- D. Planning Commission **Resolution 10-15** recommending adoption of the Statement of Reasons to Permit Development in a Mineral Resource Zone.

MEMO TO PLANNING COMMISSION (NOVEMBER 16, 2010) – BRSP DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT


ATTACHMENT 4

Comparison of Plan Area 1 Access Options						
	Herdal Drive	Maidu Drive	May Perry Drive	Pacific Street	South of Pacific Street	Tea Lane
Approximate Road Length	<1,000'	1,300'	4,500'	3,500'	3,000'	4,500'
Number of Bridges	1	1	2	3	3	1
Approximate UPRR Bridge Span	70'	400'	n/a	150-200'	200'	1,000'
Approx Combined Bridge Span	70'	400'	500+'	700+'	700+'	1,000+'
Residences Affected?	15 adjacent backyards	10+/- adjacent backyards	None	None	None	Traverses 2+ residential parcels; 1 outbuilding lost
Approximate ROW Acquisition	0	1,300'	2,000'	1,000'	500'	2,400'
Acres Disturbed	1	2 to 3	6 to 10	5 to 8	4 to 7	2 to 3
Woodland Acres Disturbed	0.5	1 to 2	4 to 7	4 to 7	3 to 5	1 to 2
Other Effects	Bloomer Cut crossed	Wetlands filled; Traverses Open Space	Road & Bridges in Ravines; Traverses ARD Rec Park	Road & Bridges in Ravines	Road & Bridges in Ravines	Perry Ranch Rd widened for 300'

BALTIMORE RAVINE SITE ACCESS ALTERNATIVES JANUARY 18, 2010

LEGEND

- #1 RECOMMENDED SITE ACCESS
- #2-#5 ALTERNATIVE ACCESS LOCATIONS EVALUATED
- POTENTIAL BRIDGE LOCATIONS



RECEIVED

JAN 20 2011

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
CITY OF AUBURN

ATTACHMENT 3

18 January 2011

City of Auburn California
City Council Members
Bill Kirby
Keith Nesbitt
Kevin Hanely
Mike Holmes
Bridget POWERS

City Planning Commission Members
Matt Spokely
Bob Snyder
Fred Vitas
Alan Young
Lisa Worthington

Reference: the Baltimore Ravine Project

I consider this an addendum to the discussions I've heard at Planning Commission and City Council meetings.

I've not heard discussion on the following two topics, and before the project is "set in stone", maybe they should be discussed.

1. Traffic....in all the discussion(s), there has never been (or I've not heard) a discussion of the possibility of actually talking with Cal Trans regarding an exit and entrance from Interstate 80 to the project.

Yes...the possibility would pose many questions and problems that can be easily avoided by doing the "easy thing", taking the easy way out and create the jig saw puzzle for traffic that has been proposed.

Yes, it would be time consuming, it would be EXPENSIVE (but that would not have to be the city's responsibility).

On the positive side, it would relieve traffic from Auburn-Folsom Road, established neighboring areas might not be totally distressed and disturbed (as they well may be with the present ideas) and it would offer safer entrance and exit from a well planned highway vs. Indian Hill Road (which every one in Auburn knows can be (has been) a "killer").

2. Phases 1 and 2.....A Planned Community....

Much "speak" about the positives of the Baltimore Ravine Project as a planned "whole" community....however, things seem to come apart when the two parts of the project are discussed.

Phase 1 gets all the conversation: bottom line all I can figure out is that Phase 2 will NOT be started until Phase 1 is finished. However, Phase 2 is the part of the project that will include the shopping areas, tying the two phases together (along with parks and other amenities) and fulfill the concept of a "planned community"

Either it is to be a completely planned project, with reasonable time lines of completion, sound, secure financing with the city's interests secured by appropriate bonding, financial back up of the developer for all the necessary phases (parts) of the project, prior to the city approving the project.

Or, is it one of those projects where we (the citizens and tax payers) trust to luck and hope everything works out for the best? (there have been a few projects that have not, over the past years).

Whatever we do today, we, and our progeny will have to deal with in the future. My wish is that we don't leave them with problems we could have anticipated and taken care of now.

Let's really think about the consequences, long term, of what is at stake.

Yours truly,



Sara Ann Ough
1380 Pajaro Court
Auburn, Ca 95603

Cc:
Auburn Journal
1030 High Street
Auburn, CA 95603

RECEIVED

JAN 24 2011

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
CITY OF AUBURN

22 January 2011

ATTACHMENT 4

Planning Commission
City of Auburn
City Hall

Matt Spokeley
Rob Snyder
Irel Vitas
Alan Young
Kean Worthington

To - Commission Members:

I realize that you're reviewing the "street",
"access" problems associated w/ the Baltimore
Lodge Project, at the request of the City Council.

However, I couldn't resist, after seeing the
enclosed newspaper articles this week, reminding
you there may be more that should be addressed
than "streets".

When even the "pundits" cannot predict
when the housing market may/will turn
around, putting on additional 700+ homes in
the Auburn market in the next few years,
doesn't seem to offer a solution to the
present problem of unsold homes.

Something to think about.

Lara Ann Ough
1380 Pagano Ct.
Auburn, CT 05203

Desperate homeowners seek advice on short sales, foreclosure

Dear Sue,

This economy has turned my financial house upside down. I lost most of my savings when a couple of investments that I had didn't pan out. It's hard to believe that at 83 years old I am being forced to sell my home in a short sale.

My lender said that they want me to make a financial contribution as a condition of approval. My agent said that they couldn't touch my retirement funds. Is this true? Who do I talk to about it?

My head has been in the sand. I put off looking at my situation for way too long. There's so much shame connected to all of this for me.

I received a notice of default more than 90 days ago. Much to my surprise I came home and found a notice of sale posted on my front door.

They say they are going to sell my house in 20 days. I raised my kids here. I can't even sleep at night. My friends are telling me that I need to save what I can of my credit and do a short sale instead of letting the bank foreclose on me.

Retirement accounts are protected in California. Talk to your tax or real estate attorney. They can write a letter addressed to your lender stating that your savings is in a protected retirement account. This should be

Your agent is correct. Retirement accounts are protected in California. Talk to your tax or real estate attorney. They can write a letter addressed to your lender stating that your savings is in a protected retirement account. This should be

Retirement accounts are protected in California. Talk to your tax or real estate attorney. They can write a letter addressed to your lender stating that your savings is in a protected retirement account. This should be

Is it too late?

~ Frantic Franny

Dear Franny,

Your feelings are understandable. It's not uncommon to bury one's head in the sand. Shame will make one do things that one would not normally do. Rest assured that it's not too late to request a short sale. But there is no guarantee that the lender will postpone the sale.

The only guarantee I can give you at this time is that if you don't ask you won't get it. With an aggressive and resourceful short sale spe-

cialist you have a better chance of getting the sale postponed with or without an offer. Franny, whatever you do, don't move out of your house during the short sale process. It will bring a whole new set of issues.

I am thinking about giving my house back to the bank with a deed in lieu of foreclosure. I don't have the stomach to go through the short sale process. My kids are begging me to take everything out of the house, including the light fixtures, appliances and the heating and air system. They said that I get the best of you.

Dear Sue,

Naughty, naughty! I don't know if you would get spanked but you would definitely be sued for waste by the lender. It could be very costly. Think about it. Once you deed the property over, taking those fixtures and appliances is stealing. Don't let your frustration get the best of you.

Dear Tina,

Naughty, naughty! I don't know if you would get spanked but you would definitely be sued for waste by the lender. It could be very costly. Think about it. Once you deed the property over, taking those fixtures and appliances is stealing. Don't let your frustration get the best of you.

Dear Tina,

Naughty, naughty! I don't know if you would get spanked but you would definitely be sued for waste by the lender. It could be very costly. Think about it. Once you deed the property over, taking those fixtures and appliances is stealing. Don't let your frustration get the best of you.

Dear Tina,

Naughty, naughty! I don't know if you would get spanked but you would definitely be sued for waste by the lender. It could be very costly. Think about it. Once you deed the property over, taking those fixtures and appliances is stealing. Don't let your frustration get the best of you.

Dear Tina,

Naughty, naughty! I don't know if you would get spanked but you would definitely be sued for waste by the lender. It could be very costly. Think about it. Once you deed the property over, taking those fixtures and appliances is stealing. Don't let your frustration get the best of you.

Dear Tina,



adequate.

Dear Sue,

My head has been in the sand. I put off looking at my situation for way too long. There's so much shame connected to all of this for me.

I received a notice of default more than 90 days ago. Much to my surprise I came home and found a notice of sale posted on my front door.

They say they are going to sell my house in 20 days. I raised my kids here. I can't even sleep at night. My friends are telling me that I need to save what I can of my credit and do a short sale instead of letting the bank foreclose on me.

Retirement accounts are protected in California. Talk to your tax or real estate attorney. They can write a letter addressed to your lender stating that your savings is in a protected retirement account. This should be

Your agent is correct. Retirement accounts are protected in California. Talk to your tax or real estate attorney. They can write a letter addressed to your lender stating that your savings is in a protected retirement account. This should be

Retirement accounts are protected in California. Talk to your tax or real estate attorney. They can write a letter addressed to your lender stating that your savings is in a protected retirement account. This should be

Call Mary Paniagua at 530-852-0269 to reserve your advertising space!

Sierra Pacific Real Estate
16898 Placer Hills Rd. • Meadow Vista, CA 95722
530-878-5100 DRE# 01396513 www.sierrapacificrealestate.com

MOBILE HOME in Auburn 2 bd., 2 bath in Rock Creek Mobile home park w/pool & clubhouse	\$22,500
GREAT OPPORTUNITY Build your dream home. Well in, electric to property, septic percol for sand filtration system. Min. from Meadow Vista.	\$87,000
LAND on desirable Cuckoo Ct. area. Well in & PERC done on 1.9 acres in Applegate.	\$130,000
DIAMOND IN THE ROUGH - Fixer, 3 bd./2 bath located on a private, shady 1.2 acres in Meadow Vista. Lots of potential!	PENDING \$150,000
HEATHER GLEN ESTATES w/ 2 bd./2 ba has spacious living room, garden area, storage shed and workshop on property	\$170,000
BUILD ON THE PROPERTY WHILE LIVING IN THE HOME! 5.26 acres of privacy with a view. Included is electrical, well & driveway are in only needs an updated septic! New House Plans included for a log home in the sale! Currently has a 2 bedroom mobile home to live in while building in Weimar!	
SELLER FINANCING MAY BE AVAILABLE	
NEW & IMPROVED roof, carpet & paint in Weimar. Home is 3 bd./2 bath, family room w/fireplace, screened in sun porch, shed, and room for RV.	\$189,000
SPARKLING CLEAN single story Meadow Vista home is 3 bd./2 ba, 1843 sq. ft. on 4+ acres w/access to Winchester Riding Trails.	SOLD \$225,000
DESIRABLE MEADOW VISTA 2400 sq. ft., 3 bd./3 ba, 1.7 ac. W/second pond! Guest/m-law quarters, sunlight basement & more.	REDUCED \$265,000
	\$289,000

Recent real estate transactions in Placer County

The following transactions took place between Jan. 3 and Jan. 10, 2011. Information provided by CoreLogic.

[illegible]

Audrey Baker
Realtor®, CDPE, Property Manager
Call: (916) 595-7885 • (530) 887-3462
abaker@come2audrey.com

*Personalized Service From A Marketing Expert
Who Is Focused on Making Your Dream Come True!*

**DON'T LET MORTGAGE PAYMENTS PUT
PRESSURE ON YOUR FAMILY!**

If you or someone you know are faced with possibly



• **Providing Information**
 • **Sharing Solutions**
 • **Expanding Possibilities**

2-Family Friendly
 Home is spacious and
 classy on 4 fenced acres
 for critters. Designer
 pool and main level living.
 MLS# 10091654 **\$450,000**

CAROLYN METZKER
"YOUR RECIPE FOR RESULTS"
916.532.4237 CELL
LYON REAL ESTATE
 www.Carlyn.com
 1900 GRASS VALLEY HWY, STE. 100
 AUBURN, CA 95603
 DRE0185721

10940 OAK VIEW TERRACE
SOUTH AUBURN
 Bank owned quality custom home on large cul-de-sac lot. New paint and carpet. 3 bedrooms + den, 2 bathrooms, amenities, 2158 sqft. Great location close to town and

OPEN 1-4
Sat & Sun



For information on
these homes, call
your local Realtor®

Local Real Estate Foreclosures

APLEGATE

100 Gilbert Dr. 2/2 \$139,000

AUBURN

15836 Applegate Rd. 2/1 \$69,900
13021 Lincoln Way #81 2/2 \$104,900
9623 Wise Rd. 3/1 \$110,000
12385 Dry Creek Rd. 2/2 \$119,900
213 Electric St. 2/1 \$129,900
159 Stephen Ave. 2/1 \$148,900
1000 Auburn Ravine Rd. 3/2 \$159,000
395 Placer St. 3/2 \$169,900
655 Shockley Rd. 3/1 \$174,000
6384 Barbara Ln. 3/3 \$180,000
350 Upper Lake Rd. 3/2 \$190,000
681 Millertown Rd. 3/2 \$244,900
1871 Auburn Folsom Rd. 2/3 \$277,433
232 Post Smith Dr. 5/3 \$297,968
11008 Palomino Ct. 4/3 \$299,900
2725 Vista Robie Dr. 4/3 \$309,500
8922 Memory Ln. 3/2 \$319,900
3435 Oak Creek Ct. 3/2 \$333,000
3165 Ray Cir. 3/2 \$349,900
1590 Cornell Way. 5/3 \$397,000
13730 Bell Brook Dr. 5/4 \$425,000
1490 Ridgeview Cir. 3/4 \$435,000
11409 Fawn Creek Ct. 5/5 \$439,900

COLFAX

22719 Tree Farm Rd. 1/1 \$84,900
136 Scholtz Ave. 1/1 \$94,900
25880 Rollins Lake Rd. 4/2 \$124,000
226 Glendale Rd. 3/2 \$129,900
987 Timber Hills Rd. 2/1 \$164,900
1450 Pleasant Ridge Rd. 2/2 \$204,900
600 Secret Town Ln. 4/2 \$205,900
901 Hope Hill Ct. 4/4 \$404,900

COOL

2597 Westville Tr. 3/2 \$114,900
2978 Sweetwater Tr. 3/2 \$119,000
2112 Tegra Rd. 3/2 \$135,900
2970 Sweetwater Tr. 3/2 \$136,500
3554 Secret Lake Tr. 3/2 \$140,000
2498 Sweetwater Tr. 3/2 \$184,900
2511 Big Strike Tr. 3/2 \$190,000
3255 Secret Lake Tr. 3/3 \$194,900
2681 Brown Bear Ct. 3/2 \$214,900
2023 Kit Fox Ct. 3/3 \$220,000
1911 Sweetwater Ct. 3/3 \$230,000

DUTCH FLAT

33246 Ridge Rd. 3/2 \$224,900

FORESTHILL

5870 Madrone Dr. 3/1 \$129,900
6115 Green Oak Ct. 3/2 \$199,900
20675 Birchwood Dr. 3/2 \$202,900
6532 Whitetail Ct. 3/3 \$259,900
5780 Silverleaf Dr. 4/3 \$267,900
5706 Potter Ln. 4/4 \$359,580
6460 Longridge Ct. 4/3 \$399,000

GARDEN VALLEY

4361 Brush Bunny Ln. 2/1 \$129,900
5280 Marshall Rd. 2/2 \$135,000
5460 Whitney Ct. 3/2 \$171,000
4510 Larapin Way. 3/3 \$196,500
6340 Roller Coaster Rd. 4/4 \$299,900

GEORGETOWN

6292 Lower Main St. 2/1 \$78,000
3080 Evergreen Ct. 3/2 \$95,000
6325 Main St. 3/2 \$159,900
9271 Stickerbush Tr. 2/2 \$164,500
2461 Buffalo Hill Rd. 3/2 \$184,900

GOLD RUN

1386 Garrett Rd. 3/2 \$140,000

GRANITE BAY

7192 West Ln. 4/2 \$394,900
4524 Shari Way. 5/3 \$431,000
4935 Bentwood Way. 4/3 \$535,000
5000 Eagleton Way. 4/4 \$559,900
5718 Via Montecito Ct. 5/5 \$861,500
5135 Stirling St. 5/5 \$949,900
5013 Westbury Cir. 5/5 \$969,000

GREENWOOD

3730 Pilgrim Ct. 1/1 \$85,000

LINCOLN

3010 Sierra View Cir #1 2/2 \$98,000
2030 Sierra View Cir #1 2/2 \$100,000
442 A St. 2/1 \$104,000
1331 St. 3/2 \$119,900
367 J St. 2/1 \$120,900
1614 5th St. 3/2 \$129,900
612 O St. 3/1 \$134,900
1020 Sierra View Cir #3 3/3 \$137,900
1030 Sierra View Cir #Unit 3 3/3 \$137,900
494 Navigator Dr. 2/3 \$139,900
220 Phoenix Cir. 3/3 \$140,000
1608 Shamrock Ct. 3/2 \$142,500
1737 Richard Rd. 3/2 \$144,000
607 Zoe Ann Dr. 3/2 \$147,000
4100 Benton Dr. 3/3 \$148,700
464 Navigator Dr. 2/3 \$151,000
1282 Landmark Cir. 3/3 \$154,900
3 Crystalwood Cir. 3/3 \$158,990

1573 1st St. 4/2 \$159,900
1006 Hudson Cir. 3/4 \$160,000
2050 Rickenbacker Ln. 3/3 \$165,900
1542 1st St. 3/2 \$171,900
470 Navigator Dr. 3/3 \$172,000
698 H St. 4/3 \$184,500
680 H St. 4/3 \$184,500
692 H St. 4/3 \$184,500
686 H St. 4/3 \$184,500
415 O St. 4/3 \$184,900
1536 Hardscrabble Rd. 3/3 \$184,900
15 Crystalwood Cir. 2/1 \$188,990
1068 Downing Cir. 4/3 \$190,000
7901 St. 3/3 \$199,900
284 Lariat Loop. 2/2 \$203,490
2191 Auburn Rd. 2/2 \$204,900
716 Sheffield Ln. 4/3 \$204,900
1351 Regent Cir. 4/3 \$206,000
59 E St. 3/3 \$208,990
1276 Waverton Ln. 4/3 \$209,000
1446 Alberton Cir. 4/3 \$209,900
1237 Tiverton Ln. 4/4 \$209,900
7 Crystalwood Cir. 4/3 \$209,990
1253 Barnhill Ln. 3/3 \$211,000
207 Wyatt Ct. 3/2 \$211,400
2747 Mallia Rd Way. 5/4 \$211,900
1253 Tavistock Ln. 4/4 \$214,900
113 Danby Ct. 4/3 \$214,900
1117 Canvasback Cir. 3/2 \$218,000
684 Aspen Meadows Way. 4/2 \$219,900
1900 Duckton Ln. 2/2 \$224,400
51 E St. 3/3 \$228,990
1318 Woodford Ln. 5/3 \$229,900
1004 Silverton Cir. 4/3 \$237,900
1060 Silverton Cir. 4/3 \$239,900
1100 Silverton Cir. 4/3 \$239,900
1118 Kirkland Ln. 5/3 \$239,900
2248 Celtic Dr. 4/3 \$244,000
1104 Tiger Lily Ln. 2/2 \$244,900
2013 Hamersley Ln. 4/3 \$245,000
1861 Monument Dr. 2/2 \$249,900
1572 Answorth Ln. 4/4 \$249,900
1345 Regent Cir. 5/3 \$254,900
1742 La Guardia Cir. 3/3 \$259,900
7465 Nicolaus Rd. 1/1 \$259,900
1506 Soney Cross Ln. 3/3 \$274,900
1589 Montrose Ln. 5/4 \$279,900
1301 Underwood Ln. 3/3 \$284,000
754 Deer Park Dr. 2/2 \$290,000
2249 Monument Dr. 4/3 \$299,900
1436 Wyndham Ln. 5/5 \$299,900
2121 Coldwater Ln. 2/2 \$319,900
788 Wagon Wheel Ln. 2/2 \$324,900
500 Soaring Hawk Ct. 4/3 \$339,000
2842 Autumn Falls Ln. 4/4 \$351,900
348 Sawmill Ln. 2/2 \$369,900
112 Cresta Ct. 5/6 \$601,900
2105 Prado Vista. 5/5 \$845,000
2020 Prado Vista. 4/5 \$874,062

For information on
these homes, call
your local Realtor®

Local Real Estate Foreclosures

LOOMIS

3509 Sun Knoll Dr.....2/2.....\$122,500
3730 Callison St.....2/1.....\$194,000
5916 Mareta Ln.....4/3.....\$314,900
5031 Lexington Cir.....4/5.....\$952,300

MEADOW VISTA

990 Mill Rd.....3/2.....\$134,900
1491 Volley Rd.....3/2.....\$149,900

NEWCASTLE

1825 S Kellogg Rd.....3/2.....\$149,900
3150 Edgewood Ln.....4/3.....\$555,000

PENRYN

3050 China Mine.....3/3.....\$395,000

PILOT HILL

4775 Pedro Hill Rd.....3/2.....\$169,500
4220 Amity Ln.....3/2.....\$170,000
5345 Rattlesnake Bar Rd.....5/3.....\$279,900
5640 Forgotten Loop.....5/4.....\$366,900

PLACERVILLE

7233 Dead Horse Rd.....3/2.....\$165,000

PLEASANT GROVE

7633 Locust Rd.....1/1.....\$895,000

ROCKLIN

3001 Beachcomber Dr.....1/1.....\$68,500
4355 Robinson Way.....3/1.....\$75,000
1250 Whitney Ranch Pkwy #227.....2/2.....\$92,000
2439 S Whitney Blvd.....2/1.....\$99,900
1251 Whitney Ranch Pkwy #1211.....3/2.....\$104,900
1221 Whitney Ranch Pkwy #1118.....3/2.....\$104,900
1240 Whitney Ranch Pkwy #316.....3/2.....\$109,000
4315 Jamerson Dr.....3/1.....\$123,500
5916 Meadowdale Dr.....3/2.....\$130,500
4350 Jamerson Dr.....4/1.....\$137,000
4510 Ivy Ln.....5/2.....\$139,000
2608 Zephyr.....2/2.....\$139,900
3028 Springview Meadows Dr.....2/2.....\$153,500
5623 Miners Cir.....3/2.....\$159,900
4605 5th St.....2/2.....\$159,900
919 Marvin Gardens Way.....2/3.....\$174,840
1020 Boardwalk Way.....2/3.....\$179,000
5735 Casa Grande Ave.....3/3.....\$184,900
5410 Whitney Blvd.....3/2.....\$189,900
6052 Kingwood Cir.....3/3.....\$194,500
5080 Meyers St.....3/3.....\$194,900
6127 Lonetree Blvd.....3/2.....\$200,000

5608 Miners Cir.....3/2.....\$205,000
5564 Cabrillo Ct.....3/3.....\$214,273
5485 Paragon St.....3/2.....\$215,000
5556 Cabrillo Ct.....3/3.....\$222,870
5751 Summit Dr.....4/3.....\$224,900
5480 Aguilar Rd.....3/2.....\$229,900
5740 Terrace Dr.....3/3.....\$239,900
4017 Coldwater Dr.....2/2.....\$244,900
3455 Midas Ave.....3/2.....\$249,900
4501 Pheasant Ln.....3/2.....\$249,900
3326 Zircon Dr.....4/3.....\$259,000
5709 Balfor Rd.....3/2.....\$259,990
3993 Aiken Dairy Rd.....4/3.....\$264,900
6212 Arctic Loon Way.....4/3.....\$274,900
6557 Powder Ridge Dr.....4/3.....\$279,900
4917 Dewey Ct.....4/3.....\$279,900
5506 Lea Ct.....4/3.....\$284,900
4585 N Star St.....5/4.....\$299,000
6500 Cleveland Ct.....3/2.....\$310,500
5405 Sandpiper Ct.....4/3.....\$319,500
1646 Abilene Cir.....4/4.....\$329,900
1874 Stagline Cir.....4/3.....\$339,900
4701 Gatwick Ct.....3/2.....\$350,900
4627 Bromwich Ct.....4/3.....\$500,000

ROSEVILLE

303 Harding Blvd #1.....2/1.....\$59,900
104 Hap Arnold Loop.....3/2.....\$60,000
501 Gibson Dr #1512.....1/1.....\$73,440
1675 Vernon St #87.....2/1.....\$75,000
701 Gibson Dr #723.....1/1.....\$75,900
1989 Inglis Way.....2/2.....\$82,000
309 Duranta St.....2/1.....\$84,900
1675 Vernon St #5.....3/3.....\$88,000
501 Gibson Dr #811.....2/2.....\$92,000
510 Arlene Dr #B.....2/2.....\$99,900
701 Gibson Dr #1514.....2/2.....\$99,900
501 Gibson Dr #1714.....2/2.....\$104,900
1475 E Hidalgo Cir.....2/2.....\$104,900
10001 Woodcreek Oaks Blvd #517.....3/2.....\$113,000
301 Whyte Ave.....3/1.....\$119,000
1513 Gerry Way.....3/1.....\$124,900
1675 Vernon St #47.....3/2.....\$124,900
1203 Palm.....3/2.....\$124,900
401 La Rosa Ct.....2/2.....\$130,000
533 Elefa St.....2/1.....\$132,900
501 Arlene Dr #A.....2/1.....\$136,500
501 Gibson Dr #222.....3/2.....\$139,900
236 Live Oak Cir.....3/3.....\$139,900
412 Shannon Way.....4/2.....\$144,900
105 Eddie Dr.....3/2.....\$144,900
1211 Glenbrook Ave.....3/2.....\$149,900
101 Dante Cir.....2/3.....\$159,900
3121 Calypso Ln.....2/2.....\$164,900
1315 Sheffield Way.....3/2.....\$164,900
211 4th St.....3/2.....\$169,900

1337 Trevor Ct.....2/2.....\$169,900
2172 Beatty Way.....3/2.....\$179,900
1312 Susan Cir.....3/2.....\$184,900
1012 Treasure Ln.....3/2.....\$185,000
1106 Windermere Ave.....4/2.....\$189,000
1400 Vista Creek Dr.....3/2.....\$189,900
1408 Black Bear St.....3/2.....\$194,900
1824 Broad Stripes Way.....3/2.....\$199,900
330 W Duranta St.....4/3.....\$199,900
809 Herbert St.....3/2.....\$200,000
653 Lyndhurst Ave.....4/2.....\$200,500
502 Jesse Ave.....3/3.....\$201,000
1702 Oakview Dr.....3/2.....\$202,000
1307 Sheridan Ave.....3/2.....\$204,000
502 Diamond Bar Ln.....3/3.....\$209,900
600 Cortez Ave.....2/2.....\$212,000
1422 Elm St.....3/2.....\$214,000
28 Villa Gardens Ct.....4/3.....\$214,500
1301 Fuhrman Way.....4/3.....\$214,900
1419 Tiffany Cir.....5/3.....\$214,900
1832 Carmelitan Dr.....3/2.....\$224,900
1046 Mcrae Way.....3/3.....\$224,900
253 Duranta St.....3/2.....\$225,000
2238 Longview Dr.....4/3.....\$229,900
3209 Acton Way.....3/2.....\$229,900
233 Rochelle Ct.....3/2.....\$232,000
1816 Ambridge Dr.....4/3.....\$235,800
501 Tarrant Ct.....3/2.....\$240,000
1222 Zinfandel Dr.....4/3.....\$241,000
1526 Lathwell Way.....3/2.....\$251,000
1314 Longfellow Cir.....3/2.....\$252,700
1910 Branding Iron Way.....4/2.....\$254,900
1481 Black Bear St.....4/3.....\$259,900
2241 Longview Dr.....4/3.....\$259,900
1717 Calle Campana.....4/2.....\$265,000
1314 Rolling Hills Dr.....3/2.....\$269,900
2016 Tralee Ct.....4/2.....\$279,900
1621 Misty Wood Dr.....4/2.....\$289,000
316 Trimstone.....3/3.....\$290,000
517 Fifteen Mile Dr.....4/3.....\$309,000
1401 Mcbride Dr.....4/3.....\$324,900
1224 Kirkhill Dr.....5/3.....\$346,500
1890 Ridgeview Dr.....3/3.....\$349,000
3364 Chapelle Dr.....4/3.....\$351,000
340 Emerson Ct.....4/3.....\$364,900
9412 Moondancer Cir.....5/3.....\$381,000
1789 Morella Cir.....6/3.....\$412,900
2721 Bickleigh Loop.....5/4.....\$420,900
2772 Carradale Dr.....3/3.....\$459,900
2220 Belvedere Cir.....5/5.....\$489,000
400 Misty Haven Ct.....4/4.....\$539,900
1701 Grazziani Way.....6/5.....\$649,900
4921 Waterstone.....5/4.....\$672,180

WEIMAR

21430 El Rancho Ln.....3/3.....\$230,000

Home sales hit 13-year low; slow recovery ahead

BY MARTIN CRUTSINGER

AP ECONOMICS WRITER

WASHINGTON (AP) — The number of people who bought previously owned homes last year fell to the lowest level in 13 years, and economists say it will be years before the housing market fully recovers.

High unemployment and a record number of foreclosures are deterring potential buyers who fear home prices haven't reached the bottom. Job growth is expected to pick up this year, but not enough to raise home sales to healthier levels.

"We built too many houses during the boom, and now after the crash, it will take us a long time to get back to normal," said David Wyss, chief economist at Standard & Poor's in New York.

The National Association of Realtors reported Thursday that sales dropped 4.8 percent to 4.91 million units in 2010. That was slightly fewer than in 2008, which had been the weakest year since 1997.

The poor year for sales did end on a stronger note. Buyers snapped up homes at a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 5.28 million units in December, the best sales pace since May and the 12.8 percent rise from November was the biggest one-month surge in 11 years.

Gains in mortgage rates may have spurred some fence-sitters to buy homes in December before rates moved higher, analysts noted.

The increase was an encouraging sign after a dismal year for home sales, said Mark Zandi, chief economist at Moody's Analytics. But he cautioned against raising expectations for a rapid recovery in housing.

"The job market is still very weak, and unemployment is very high. Until we get more jobs, people will be reticent about buying homes," he said.

Zandi said home prices would fall another 5 percent this year. Sales of previously occupied homes would likely exceed 5 million. That's a slight improvement from last year, he said, but it will probably take until 2013 or 2014 for sales to reach a healthy level of 6 million units a year.

Home sales will benefit from an improved hiring market. Many economists predict employers will double the number of jobs added this year compared with 2010. A reason for more optimism is a decline in the number of people applying for unemployment benefits over the past four months.

Last week, applications fell to a seasonally adjusted 404,000, the Labor Department said. That followed a spike in applications in the previous week, which is typical after the holidays end and employers let temporary workers go. Even with the holiday bump and this past week's decline, the latest figures were only slightly higher than the 391,000 level reached last month — the lowest in more than two years.

Fewer than 425,000 people applying for benefits is considered a signal of modest job growth.

Economists say applications must fall consistently to 375,000 or fewer to substantially reduce the unem-

From: Stephen L. Des Jardins/DCP [mailto:sld@dcpltd.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 25, 2011 7:17 AM
To: Will Wong
Subject: Fw: Baltimore Ravine Investors, LLC - Access Over Herdal Road
Importance: High

Will,

As the Planning Commission and City Council review access to the project, I want them to have the best information available, and would ask that you forward this e-mail to them for their review.

Tim Ward is a senior underwriter for First American Title Company who wrote the title insurance for the project, and below he details the access that has occurred since 1965. The Chevreux Parcel he refers to is currently zoned for 300 units, and has been zoned since at least the 1970's.

This forward planning for access by the historical owners and the City has existed now for 46 years. I hope this is helpful.

Stephen L. Des Jardins
 (916)786-8158 Office
 (916)580-8549 Cell

----- Forwarded by Stephen L. Des Jardins/DCP on 01/25/2011 06:55 AM -----

"Ward, Tim" <Tward@firstam.com>

To "Stephen L. Des Jardins/DCP" <sld@dcpltd.com>

cc

01/21/2011 01:04 PM

Subject Baltimore Ravine Investors, LLC - Access Over Herdal Road

Stephen

First American has researched record access from the land owned by Baltimore Ravine Investors, LLC, which is tax parcel 040-050-010-000 and is referred to below as the "Chevreux Parcel," to Auburn-Folsom Road. There are two types of record access that benefit the Chevreux Parcel; a private access easement and access over a public street known as Herdal Road.

In particular, the private access easement, which provides the Chevreux Parcel with record access to Auburn-Folsom Road, was created by that certain "Order Approving Fifth and Final Accounting . . . Decree of Distribution" for the Estate of George J. Herdal that was recorded on September 8, 1965 in Vol. 1080, Page 233 (the "1965 Private Easement"). The 1965 Private Easement runs easterly from the SPRR Co. parcel and terminates at Auburn-Folsom Road. The specific location of 1965 Private Easement was not described on the Order.

Subsequently, the location of a portion of the 1965 Private Easement was fixed by the "Judgment Fixing Location of Easement . . ." that was recorded on March 19, 1987 in Book 3150 at Page 530 (the "1987 Judgment"), which is the same location as the public street known as Herdal Road that is shown on the map of Vista Del Valle Unit 4 recorded over a year later on May 10, 1988. The location of the portion of the 1965 Private Easement that was fixed by the 1987 Judgment terminates on the eastern line of the map of Vista Del Valle Unit 4, which is the western terminus of Herdal Road, an already existing public street, as shown on the map of Vista Del Valle Unit 1 that recorded on June 7, 1977. The 1965 Private Easement continues to run from the eastern line of the map of Vista Del Valle Unit 4, easterly, to Auburn-Folsom Road. The owner(s) who filed the maps of Vista Del Valle Units 1 and 4 dedicated Herdal Road to the City of Auburn as a public street; the City accepted such dedications on the maps.

Therefore, Baltimore Ravine Investors, LLC, the owner of the Chevreux Parcel, has both private and public access to Auburn-Folsom Road.

Tim Ward

Division Underwriter
Vice President



First American

First American Title Company
Homebuilders Services
2200A Douglas Blvd Suite 275, Roseville, CA 95661
Office: 916-677-2625
Cell: 415-515-8930
Fax: 866-373-6882
Email: tward@firstam.com

A member of the [First American Financial Corporation](#)
family of companies | NYSE: FAF

This message contains confidential information intended only for the use of the addressee(s) named above and may contain information that is legally privileged. If you are not the addressee, or the person responsible for delivering it to the addressee, you are hereby notified that reading, disseminating, distributing or copying this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message by mistake, please immediately notify us by replying to the message and delete the original message immediately thereafter. Thank you.



BASES OF BEARING
THE MERIDIAN OF THIS SURVEY IS IDENTICAL WITH THE MERIDIAN OF THAT SURVEY FILED IN BOOK 23 OF PARCEL MAPS, AT PAGE 77, P. C. 2., AND IS BASED ON MONUMENTS SHOWN HEREON AS FOUND.

BOOK 1 OF MAPS, AT PAGE 13

OWNER'S CERTIFICATE

WE HEREBY CERTIFY THAT WE ARE THE OWNERS OF, OR HAVE SOME RIGHT, TITLE OR INTEREST IN AND TO THE REAL PROPERTY INCLUDED WITHIN THE SUBDIVISION SHOWN UPON THIS MAP AND EXCEPT AS SHOWN ON THIS MAP AND CERTIFICATES MADE A PART HEREOF, WE ARE THE ONLY PERSONS WHOSE CONSENT IS NECESSARY TO PASS A CLEAR TITLE TO SAID PROPERTY, AND WE AGREE TO THE MAKING OF SAID MAP AND SUBDIVISION AS SHOWN, WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES, EXCEPT LINES AND AREAS INDICATED THE ENCUMBRANCES AS SHOWN ON THE MAP FOR THE PURPOSES INDICATED.

Betty R. Buntin
BETTY R. BUNTIN
OWNER


STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF PLACER

ON THIS 21ST DAY OF MAY 1977, BEFORE ME, a Notary Public in and for said County and State, personally appeared Betty R. Buntin and Harold W. Buntin, known to me to be the persons whose names are subscribed to the within instrument, and acknowledged that they executed the same.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I HAVE HEREON SET MY HAND AND AFFIXED MY OFFICIAL SEAL THE DAY AND YEAR IN THIS CERTIFICATE FIRST ABOVE WRITTEN.

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES:

March 21, 1980



John D. Johnson
NOTARY PUBLIC
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

ENGINEER'S CERTIFICATE

I, L.O. KENDALL HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS MAP OF VISTA DEL VALLE UNIT, CORRECTLY REPRESENTS A SURVEY MADE BY ME OR UNDER MY SUPERVISION, THAT THE SURVEY IS TRUE AND COMPLETE, AS SHOWN; THAT ALL NECESSARY RECORDS HAVE BEEN FILED, ON OR BEFORE MARCH 1978, AND THAT SAID RECORDS WILL BE SUFFICIENT TO ENABLE THE SURVEY TO BE REPRODUCED.



L.O. Kendall
L.O. KENDALL R.C.E. 5093

CITY ENGINEER'S CERTIFICATE

I, MAURICE J. CLARK, City Engineer, City of Auburn, State of California, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I HAVE EXAMINED THIS MAP AND FIND THAT THE SUBDIVISION IS SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME AS IT APPEARED IN THE MAP AS APPROVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION, AND THAT ALL NECESSARY RECORDS HAVE BEEN COMPLIED WITH AND THAT I AM SATISFIED THAT SAID MAP IS TECHNICALLY CORRECT.

Maurice J. Clark
MAURICE J. CLARK
R.C.E. 20884

CITY COUNCIL'S CERTIFICATE

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUBURN, COUNTY OF PLACER, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, BY A RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT A REGULAR MEETING HELD ON THE 23RD DAY OF MAY 1977, DID APPROVE THIS MAP ENTITLED "VISTA DEL VALLE UNIT" AND ACCEPTS ON BEHALF OF THE PUBLIC, THE ENCUMBRANCES SHOWN ON THE MAP FOR THE PURPOSES FOR WHICH THEY ARE OFFERED.

David J. Dwyer
Mayor, City of Auburn

RECORDER'S CERTIFICATE

FILED THIS 11TH DAY OF JUNE 1977, AT 2:23 P.M. IN BOOK 1 OF MAPS AT PAGE 13 AT THE REQUEST OF KENDALL ENGINEERING.

FILE NO. 20848
FEE \$ 2.00

Therese D. Dwyer
County Recorder
County of Placer
State of California

VISTA DEL VALLE UNIT I

PAR. SEC. 21 T.12N. R.8E. M.D.B. & M.

IN THE CITY OF AUBURN

PLACER COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

APRIL 1977 SCALE 1"=50'

KENDALL ENGINEERING

VISTA DEL VALLE UNIT I

FOR SEC. 21 T.12N. R.8E. M.D.B. & M.

IN THE CITY OF AUBURN

PLACER COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

APRIL 1972

KENDALL ENGINEERING


SCALE 1" = 50'

LEGEND

- CALCULATED POINT ONLY
- P - SET 1/2" REBAR YEAR STAMPED ACE 9023 AT ALL LOT CORNERS
- 9 - AND CURVE POINTS ON RIGHT-OF-WAY
- 11 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 12 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 13 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 14 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 15 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 16 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 17 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 18 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 19 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 20 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 21 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 22 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 23 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 24 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 25 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 26 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 27 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 28 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 29 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 30 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 31 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 32 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 33 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 34 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 35 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 36 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 37 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 38 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 39 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 40 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 41 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 42 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 43 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 44 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 45 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 46 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 47 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 48 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 49 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 50 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 51 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 52 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 53 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 54 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 55 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 56 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 57 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 58 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 59 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 60 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 61 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 62 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 63 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 64 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 65 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 66 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 67 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 68 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 69 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 70 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 71 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 72 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 73 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 74 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 75 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 76 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 77 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 78 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 79 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 80 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 81 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 82 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 83 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 84 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 85 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 86 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 87 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 88 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 89 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 90 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 91 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 92 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 93 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 94 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 95 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 96 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 97 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 98 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 99 - CURVE AS NOTED
- 100 - CURVE AS NOTED

BASIS OF BEARINGS

THE BASIS OF BEARINGS OF THIS SURVEY IS THE BEARING OF NORTH 70° 10' 00" E FOR THE EAST LINE OF THE NORTH-EST 1/4 OF SEC. 21 AS NOTED IN BOOK I OF SURVEYS PAGE 85 OF A.C.P.C.




MEMORANDUM

Date: January 27, 2011

To: Auburn Community Development Department

From: Joe Olsen; Project Engineer, Uhora Engineering



Subject: Summary of Site Access Alternatives onto Auburn Folsom Road

Alternatives #4 & #5 use an identical alignment across BRSP property (roughly 3,400 feet), and across the Sipe property (roughly 700 feet), until roughly where they enter the UPRR right-of-way, at which they diverge into alternative alignments. Please note that each of the two alternatives also cross roughly 100 feet of A.R.D. property in roughly the same location. The discussion below first addresses each individual alignment as they cross UPRR right-of-way, then the remaining 4,200 feet across on-site and off-site private property where alternatives #4 & #5 are identical.

UPRR Right-of-Way**Alternative #4 -- Pacific Street (roughly 2,500 feet east of Herdal Drive):**

This option would essentially extend Pacific Street; however, due to topography, significant amounts of fill would be required (e.g. approximately 60,000 cubic yards of fill would be needed in the railroad right of way, alone). The required fill height at the abutments would be in the neighborhood of 22 feet. Also, in order to avoid existing A.R.D. facilities, this bridge would need to be built at a significant skew (approaching 45-degrees), causing this bridge option to have a span in excess of 250 feet. The construction time for this railroad crossing option could easily be double that for Alternative #1 at Herdal Drive.

Alternative #5 -- South of Pacific Street (roughly 2,000 feet east of Herdal Drive):

At this location, in order to achieve adequate clearance over the railroad tracks, significant fills would be required at the abutment approaches (approximately 12 feet high at the abutments). I estimate approximately 15,000 cubic yards of fill in order to achieve the minimum clearance required by Union Pacific. The bridge span would need to be approximately 100 feet, but could be built at a 90-degree skew. Due to the longer span, the larger abutments, and the need for fill, the construction time for this railroad crossing option would be greater (perhaps half again as long) than at Herdal Drive.

Private Property

Alternatives #4 and #5 use an identical alignment across essentially the entirety of the 4,200 feet across private property. It should be noted that the alignment described in this summary was created based upon minimum City roadway design standards; however, given the challenging terrain, the resulting steep slopes and tight curves may not be prudent for use as the primary access to the proposed project.

Due to the hilly terrain, the 4,200 feet of roadway would have areas containing significant cut and/or fill slopes, resulting in the impact of roughly 14 acres of woodlands. The maximum width of the impacted area along the alignment would be over 250 feet wide. The highest fill-slope would be in the neighborhood of 80 feet and the highest cut-slope roughly 50 feet. The portions of the proposed right-of-way for the road that occur on Sipe (700 feet) and A.R.D. (100 feet) would need to be acquired; potentially from non-cooperative owners. Both properties would be impacted by significant cut and/or fill-slopes with significant tree impacts. Each end of the alignment would contain a 15% (City maximum) longitudinal roadway slope located within tight (200-foot radius) horizontal curves; a less than desirable combination. We estimate that there would be a need to import in the neighborhood of 150,000 cubic yards of dirt to build the required fills for this roadway.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Joe Olsen
Ubora Engineering & Planning, Inc.
2901 Douglas Blvd., Suite 285
Roseville, CA 95661
Ph: 916-780-2500 ext 206